





Fine Arts

27

restitute







HNum  
C2693Kx

*J. White. M.A.*

# LECTURES

ON

## THE COINAGE

OF

THE GREEKS AND ROMANS;

DELIVERED IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

BY

EDWARD CARDWELL, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF ST. ALBAN'S HALL, AND CAMDEN PROFESSOR  
OF ANCIENT HISTORY.

---

OXFORD,

PRINTED BY S. COLLINGWOOD, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY,

FOR JOHN MURRAY,

ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON.

MDCCCXXXII.

17851  
10/11/91

6

TO THE  
LORD GRENVILLE,  
CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

§c. §c. §c. §c.

THIS VOLUME IS INSCRIBED  
WITH SENTIMENTS OF THE UTMOST RESPECT  
AND GRATITUDE.

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

## PREFACE.

---

I AM not aware of the existence of any book in our language which treats of ancient coins in the manner and with the object proposed in the following Lectures. The few English treatises which have been written upon the subject, like many of those which have appeared in other languages, have been composed for the sole benefit of the collector, and without any design of illustrating the literature and history of the ancients. The Essay of Pinkerton, for instance, in addition to the positive faults arising from the peculiar temper of the writer, affords little information on points connected with the learning of Greece or Rome, and is of no value whatever in questions of that kind, so far as they appear to depend upon his authority. Even the Essay of Addison, which might

reasonably be expected to display the scholarship as well as the gracefulness of its writer, is confined to the poetical part of the subject, being occupied with the devices of Roman coins, and more particularly with the impersonations impressed upon them, and omitting altogether the more important knowledge contained in their inscriptions<sup>a</sup>.

This then is the principal reason which has induced me to commit the following Lectures to the press. But it is not the only one. Treatises upon ancient coins may have been rendered useless by the results of more recent investigations. The subject itself, though confined in its nature to the examination of the past, partakes of the progressive character of general know-

<sup>a</sup> “ Non parlerò qui dei Musei Anglicani ai quali si  
“ puo dir mors et erit mors; cioè, Vita e tomba fu il  
“ principio; sparizione ed avello la fine. Così spiegar  
“ deesi una tal fatale sentenza; che dopo l'Haym An-  
“ glo-Romano et Wise, non abbiamo veduto se non  
“ scheletri, o dir vogliamo puri et semplici cataloghi  
“ d'un prezzo esorbitante.” Sestini, Degli Stat. Ant.  
p. 99.

ledge, as fresh materials are continually presenting themselves, and the labours of learned men are not only directed into new fields of inquiry, but are also enabled to define more accurately, and in many cases to reverse, the information which had been previously acquired. And so completely is this the case, that whatever may have been the advantages of older writers, the value of their works has been continually impaired by the more extensive observation of their successors. Even the *Doctrina Numorum* of Eckhel—for the composition of which the writer combined the rare endowments of native sagacity, unwearied patience, and considerable scholarship, with the command of an excellent library, and one of the richest of all modern cabinets—is gradually losing its estimation as a perfect work, under the influence of more recent discoveries. All writers indeed of an earlier date may still be considered as of doubtful authority, unless they are supported by the approbation of Eckhel; but even Eckhel himself is sub-

ject to the law of literary mortality, and a reputation which at one time appeared to be beyond the reach of hazard, is now beginning to shew some symptoms of decay<sup>b</sup>.

To that work, however, the following Lectures are under the greatest obligations; and wherever I have adopted opinions in opposition to it, I have not failed to support myself by the testimony of ancient authors, or the knowledge derived from more recent collectors. Even, then, if it were too presumptuous to suppose that some improvements might possibly be made upon the works of Eckhel, it may still have been a laudable undertaking to extract such materials from them as may be of the greatest interest, to throw them into a more attractive form, and to place

<sup>b</sup> A remarkable instance may be seen in his opinions respecting the gold staters of Phocæa and Cyzicus, (vol. I. p. xli. and vol. II. p. 536.) which he maintained to be a mere money of account. These opinions were opposed to the direct evidence of ancient writers, (see Lecture V.) and are now universally rejected, as staters of both kinds have been procured in the east by M. Cousinery. See Sestini, *Degli Stat. Ant.* pp. 22, 50, 103.



them easily within the reach of the English student.

But this also would have been superfluous, were there, in any of the modern languages which are now generally read, and the study of which ought still further to be encouraged, any recent numismatic work of the limited extent and complete authority of which I have been speaking. The writers of Germany are seldom satisfied, unless they can place before their readers all the possible knowledge, whether useful or otherwise, connected with their subject; as is shewn, in the present instance, by the *Lexicon* of Rasche, a work which exhausted so completely the existing sources of information, that it carefully preserved all their impurities. The Italian writers, as is exemplified in Sestini and Lanzi, are too desultory in their studies, and too much addicted to the style of composition belonging to letters and dissertations, to be qualified for a task, the first principles of which are precision and compactness; and the French manual of M. Millin, and the

more recent production, in the same language, of M. Hennin, though the latter is far superior to the former, are equally destitute of that intimate acquaintance with antiquity, without which a treatise on ancient coins is little better than an auctioneer's advertisement. The work indeed of M. Mionnet, the most valuable which has hitherto appeared in that language, was written for the express purpose of enabling the collector to complete his cabinet at the least possible expense; and, although the scale of prices has since undergone great alterations, may still be employed with advantage, as a general catalogue of coins. This work faithfully accomplished the object that was proposed by it; but the prevailing fault of French numismatic writers—a fault which is not confined to that branch of their literature—is, the substitution of ingenuity in the place of knowledge, and an utter contempt for references and quotations. It is not unusual to meet with French works, on history or antiquities, in which so few traces are to be found

of original authorities, that the writers of them might appear to be relating events which had fallen under their own observation, and in many of which their own personal interests had been concerned.

The Lectures have been committed to the press in the same words in which they were delivered. The subject would not have been treated more systematically by being thrown into a different form; and any peculiarities of style will be likely to meet with indulgence, if they can be supposed to have had their use in the way of oral teaching.

It only remains that I should mention the works which I have found most useful to me. In so doing, I shall also furnish the student with a list of authors, from whom he may derive the greatest advantage in the prosecution of his numismatic studies.

Vaillant. *Numismata Imperat.* Amstelod. 1700. 1 vol. fol.  
Spanheim. *Dissertationes de præst. et usu numism.* Amstelod. Wetstenii, 1717. 2 vols. fol.  
Froelich. *Quatuor tentamina.* Viennæ, 1797. 1 vol. 4to.

- Froelich. *Notitia elementaris numism.* Viennæ, 1758.  
1 vol. 4to.
- Wesseling. *Thesaurus Morellianus.* Amstelod. 1752.  
3 vols. fol.
- Pellerin. *Recueil de médailles.* Paris, 1762—1778. 4to.
- Beauvais. *Histoire des empereurs.* 1767.
- Dutens. *Explication de quelques médailles.* Londres,  
1776. 1 vol. 4to.
- Neumann. *Popul. et reg. numi veteres.* Vindob. 1779,  
1783. 2 vols. 4to.
- Rasche. *Lexicon universæ rei numariæ.* Lipsiæ, 1785—  
1804. 8 vols. 8vo.
- Eckhel. *Doctrina numorum veterum.* Vindob. 1792—  
1798. 8 vols. 4to.
- *Kurtzgefasste anfangsgründe zur alten numis-  
matik.* Vien. 1807. 1 vol. 8vo.
- Mionnet. *Description de médailles.* Paris, 1806—1819.  
9 vols. 8vo.
- Letronne. *Considérations sur l'évaluation des monnaies.*  
Paris, 1817. 1 vol. 4to.
- Sestini. *Lettere et dissertazioni numismatiche.* 9 vols. 4to.

# CONTENTS.

## LECTURE I.

ANALOGY between money and language—Changefulness of money, and causes thereof—Purpose for which money was invented—Maxims to be observed in constructing a monetary system—Practice of the ancients in respect to them—The mint at Athens—Conducted by the government—Purity of Athenian coinage—Compared with that of England—Massiveness of Athenian coins—Their uniformity in weight—Confinement to one single species—Minuteness of their subdivision—Freedom of exportation—Illustration derived from the coarseness of their workmanship—Similar practice of other Grecian states—Money of commerce at Athens—Banks of deposit—Exchequer bills—Art of writing—Its importance in modern commerce—Compared with the practice of the Athenians—General remarks on the same comparison—Course of investigation . . . . . p. 1

## LECTURE II.

DIFFICULTIES of the subject—Capriciousness of the evidence derived from coins—Illustrated from Corinth, Elis, and Olynthus, on the one side ; from Thasus and Dyrrachium on the other—Inconsistencies of ancient authors—Confusion arising from the records of private families—Illustrated from a Macedonian coin—From political views—Illustrated from the coins of Gelo and Hiero—From the difficulty of deciphering—Illustrated from a coin of Carausius—From the mistakes made at the mint—Illustrated from a coin of Titus

—From the practice of restamping—Illustrated from a coin of Trajan—From ancient forgeries—Illustrated from coins of Verus and Caracalla—Recapitulation . . . . . p. 27.

### LECTURE III.

FARTHER difficulties of the subject—Modern forgers—Forgers of the sixteenth century—More recent forgers—Different methods of fabrication—By changing the inscription—By giving a new impression to one side—By interchanging two reverses—By cutting new dies after ancient models—By contriving improbable accidents—Greek coin of Cicero—Proper use of coins as evidence—The object and extent of it—Examples from the coins of Thurium—From Roman coins bearing the letters S·C—From a coin of Larissa, referring to a passage of the Iliad—From a coin of Agathocles—From a coin of Himera . . . . . p. 53

### LECTURE IV.

A SCALE of criteria attempted by Barthelemy—Periods usually adopted—Period of excellence—Perfection of workmanship—Arrangement of Pellerin and Eckhel—Advantages of that arrangement—Medals and coins distinguished—Hardouin—Barthelemy—Medallions—Examples of them—Contornii—Tesseræ—Countermarks on medals—Different materials of money—Iron, tin, and lead—Gold—Its purity—Electrum—Where used—Silver—Early adulterations in Greece—Later adulterations at Rome—Copper—Brass—Corinthian brass—Minting by the hammer—Practice of Greece—Practice at Rome—Ancient dies—Count Caylus—Plaster moulds—Classification of devices—Smaller emblems—Proper names of coins . . . . . p. 79

### LECTURE V.

GRECIAN coinage—Fabulous history of it—Phido the Argive—Alexander the First of Macedon—Athenian coins—

## CONTENTS.

xv

Money of account—Athenian gold—Dispute respecting it—Aristophanes—Thucydides—Lysias—Demosthenes—Æschines—Athenian inscriptions—Darics, Cyzicenes—Athenian silver—Its purity—Tetradrachma—Didrachma, &c.—Their legends and devices—The owl of Athens—The diota—Coin of the time of Mithridates—Athenian brass—Wood and Dionysius—Dean Swift and Aristophanes—Salmasius—Recal of base money—Brass coins very numerous—Two specimens of them—Coins of Sparta—Two specimens of them—Coins of Bœotia—Orchomenus—Thebes—Passage of Xenophon amended—Coins of Elis—Mistaken for the Falisci—Explained by Payne Knight . . . . . p. 107

## LECTURE VI.

ROMAN coinage—Pliny's account of it—Inconsistency of that account—Extreme variations of standard at Rome—Pecunia—Supposed meaning of the word—Disputed—Real meaning—Illustrated from the coins of other countries—Particularly of ancient Gaul—First known devices of Roman coins—Variety of brass coins—Tokens of their current values—Silver coins—When first minted—Their current values how distinguished—Gold coins—Pliny's account of them—Disputed—Livy and Polybius—Restituti of Trajan—Opinion of Eckhel—Triumviri monetales—Triumviri mensarii—Cicero's letter to Trebatius—Anecdote of Julius Cæsar—Coins of Roman families—Likenesses on coins—The head of Roma—Explained—Restituti—Serrati . . . . . p. 135

## LECTURE VII.

ROMAN coins considered in detail—Coins of Families—Accoleius—Lariscolus—M. Lepidus—M. Lepidus. Pont. Max.—Truth of inscription disputed—Marcellinus—Spinther—Supposed origin of the name—Disputed—Real origin conjectured—Mamilius Limetanus—A passage of the Odyssey—Thorius Balbus—Bos irruens explained—Two quinarii of

Marc Antony—Foundation of Lyons—Heraldic badge of Antony—Dissertation on beards—Antony represented as Bacchus—His entry into Athens—Flattery and wit of the Athenians . . . . .	p. 161
---	--------

## LECTURE VIII.

ROMAN coins of the empire—Two coins of Augustus—Great roads of Italy—Tiberius—Twelve cities of Asia destroyed—Tacitus—Phlegon—Marble discovered at Pozzuoli—Germanicus and Agrippina—Lesbos—Caligula—His popularity—Claudius—Britain—Nero—The closing of the temple of Janus—Tacitus and Suetonius—Galba, Otho, and Vitellius—Brasses of Otho . . . . .	p. 187
---	--------

## LECTURE IX.

COINS of the empire continued—Vespasian—Rebuilding of the Capitol—Jewish tribute—Titus—The Colosseum—Imperator explained—Domitian—Device of Pallas adopted by him—Flattery of Quinctilian, and hatred of Tacitus—Nerva—Method of travelling—Gregory Nazianzen—System adopted by Augustus—Improved by Nerva—Extended by Hadrian—Trajan—Charitable institutions—Brass plate found near Piacenza—Hadrian—Circenses—The Parilia—Dissertation on the Tribunicia potestas . . . . .	p. 209
---	--------



# LECTURE I.

ANALOGY between money and language—Changefulness of money, and causes thereof—Purpose for which money was invented—Maxims to be observed in constructing a monetary system—Practice of the ancients in respect to them—The mint at Athens—Conducted by the government—Purity of Athenian coinage—Compared with that of England—Massiveness of Athenian coins—Their uniformity in weight—Confinement to one single species—Minuteness of their subdivision—Freedom of exportation—Illustration derived from the coarseness of their workmanship—Similar practice of other Grecian states—Money of commerce at Athens—Banks of deposit—Exchequer bills—Art of writing—Its importance in modern commerce—Compared with the practice of the Athenians—General remarks on the same comparison—Course of investigation.

**T**HERE is a strong resemblance between money as the representative of value, and language as the expression of thought ; and though it would be idle to run a parallel between them in all the particulars in which the resemblance might be traced, it may be well for me to employ the comparison as an introduction to my subject, illustrating by means of it some of those elementary principles of exchange to which it may be necessary to advert. Pieces of money, then, may be compared with words ; and the comparison must be made, not with proper names, which are fixed, and confined to separate individuals, nor yet with common nouns denoting classes of real and substantial objects, but with the more copious words of a language, which represent no sensible objects whatever, but only the conceptions of a man's mind. For a piece of money is not designed to mark any one individual object to be exchanged with it, or even to denote any separate class of objects, with some one or more of which it might be held to be equivalent ; but represents more truly a mental fiction, inasmuch as it measures a certain quantity of value. And that quantity of value too, like the idea expressed by an abstract noun, is not

confined to any class of objects whatever, but exists equally in things the most incongruous, and, wherever it does exist, depends as much on the mind of the valuer, as on the intrinsic qualities of the object that he prizes. Let a man examine any one of the phrases that are used by him as familiarly as household words, let him try to mark out its exact import on the several occasions on which he has employed it, and he will find, that it has perpetually been changing its affinities, according to the different relations in which it was placed, and even to the different states of mind in which he had himself employed it. The phrase, therefore, even in his own separate use of it, would seem to admit of no precise or constant demarcation of its meaning, but rather to resemble a tract of land which is continually undergoing some change of surface and of outline from the inroads of mountain torrents. But if, in addition to his own practice, he examine the same phrase as it has been employed by others, and observe the many new shades of meaning which, in this extended application of it, it is alternately imbibing and discharging, he finds, that though the word remains the same, there is no assignable limit to the changes and fluctuations of the idea that is expressed by it.

And this may in part illustrate the constant changefulness of a piece of money as a repre-

sentative of value. But this is only a partial illustration of the case. The changes hitherto noticed are derived exclusively from the operation of external causes ; from the influence, I mean, of any other values by which the worth of a given commodity would be altered, and the wants and sentiments of the individuals connected with the transfer. But, besides the office which a piece of money fills as a representative of value, it is also itself a manufacture, and is subject of necessity to the further variations of price by which all manufactures are affected. Its own value will be enhanced in proportion to its rareness, and to the workmanship employed upon it in converting it into coin. And thus are introduced other elements of disorder, from which, in combination with the rest, it would appear hopeless that money could ever become a fixed medium of exchange, or enable a man to calculate the quantity he could command, beyond the present moment, of the comforts and the necessities of life.

And yet this is the very purpose which money was designed to answer, being intended at once as a measure of present value, and a surety for the future command of value to the same amount. And this is so plainly the first principle on which all monetary systems must be constructed, that we may ascertain by its means the degree of wis-

dom which any government has shewn in the management of its money, and the extent to which in this important particular it has advanced the interests of its people.

It would seem then, that, in connexion with this subject, the following are among the practical maxims which are most deserving of attention.

1. That, as a basis or origin for the scale of money, a unit should be contrived of such a nature, as might in the least possible degree be affected by the varying circumstances of the values it was designed to measure; on the same principle on which, if we wished to know the expansive power of a given piece of metal, we should not employ a rod of the same kind of metal for the purpose of ascertaining it.

2. That if that money-unit is to be made an actual medium of exchange, we should employ for the purpose some material which is as little as possible liable to perish, or subject to fluctuations in its intrinsic worth.

3. That such material being once adopted as a legal currency, the adoption of a second material, whether it be more or less precious than the first, may be convenient for the purpose of adding fresh gradations to the scale of money, but is in a much greater degree detrimental, as increasing the disturbances which attach, even in the simplest system, to a measurement of value. It is always

easier to calculate on an equation than on a set of ratios.

4. That the standard being thus adjusted, and the precious metal employed in it having now become a local measure, it would be convenient to confine it within the country which has thus adopted it; but the same metal being also an article of commerce, and retaining its own intrinsic value, it would be idle to attempt the confinement of it, and absurd to legislate on the supposition that it was effectually confined.

5. That on the foregoing principles a currency is then the most wisely regulated, when it limits the legal sanction to one single species, when it preserves inviolably its original standard both in weight and fineness, when it measures all other metals, and all commodities whatever, not by some fixed scale, but by their existing prices; and when it is itself measured and kept in equipoise by entering freely into the transactions of foreign commerce.

I might illustrate the importance of these maxims, by shewing from the history of modern Europe, and more especially from the proceedings of the court of France, the practical evils that have ensued from the violation of them; but it will be sufficient to confirm what I have stated respecting the preservation of the standard, and the extreme caution to be observed in the manage-

ment of the coinage, by quoting the words of an able, though now neglected, writer <sup>a</sup>. “ The operations of trade,” says Steuart, “ surpass in nicety the conceptions of any man but a merchant ; and as a proof of this, it may be affirmed with truth, that one shilling can hardly lose a grain of its weight, either by fraud or circulation, without contributing, by that circumstance, towards the diminution of the standard value of the money-unit, or pound sterling, over all England.”

But it is time for me to consider how far these principles were observed in the currency of the ancients ; and as the Romans rarely shewed any thing of a scientific character in any department of their government, and as the other states of Greece are all inferior to Athens, both in their degree of refinement, and in the knowledge we possess respecting them, I shall confine myself to the practice of the Athenians, and to the period extending from the time of the Persian war to the death of Demosthenes.

Respecting the right of coinage and the administration of the mint at Athens, we have no precise information either from Grecian authors, or from any ancient inscriptions hitherto discovered. But this utter silence on a subject of so much interest affords a strong presumption that

<sup>a</sup> Sir J. Steuart, *Pol. Econ.* vol. II. p. 290.



the right was always confined to the state, and was exercised with as much secrecy as was practicable under a republican form of government. And indeed our own reflections upon the nature of the case, confirmed also by the conditions required in an advanced state of civilization, might convince us, that an instrument so important, as money is, to the intercourse and the welfare of a community, could not be left to the management of individuals, or be severed for any length of time from the first and most responsible duties of the government. And that such was actually the case at Athens, and that the public mint was conducted upon a better system than most of the other branches of the executive, will be positively shewn hereafter, in treating of the practical wisdom exhibited in the purity, the uniformity, and other important properties of the coins themselves. At present I need only refer to the evidence afforded by their inscriptions and devices, which in all cases present the full or abbreviated title of the Athenian people, together with their well known national insignia, or emblems of public prosperity; introducing only casually, and as the surface of the coin would admit of it, the names of men in office, or tokens of some separate branch of commerce.

But the most important property of the Athenian coinage was its purity, carried to so great an

extent, that no baser metal appears to have been united with it as an alloy. It may readily be supposed that the lead <sup>b</sup>, which was found together with the silver in the mines of Laurium, was not always perfectly separated from it by the ancient process of refining: but the quantity of that metal which has hitherto been discovered in the silver coin of Athens is not likely to have been added designedly; and copper, which would have been more suitable for the purpose, does not appear to have been used at any period as an alloy, much less in the way of adulteration <sup>c</sup>. This fact is the more remarkable when we compare it with the practice of modern states, and even with that of our own country <sup>d</sup>. In the reigns of Henry the Eighth and his son Edward, the silver coin was adulterated in four successive instances by a progressive increase of the quantity of alloy; till the standard was at last reduced from 11 oz. 2 dwts. fine, and 18 dwts. alloy, to the inverted ratio of 3 oz. fine, and 9 oz. alloy. The gold coin was also debased at the same period; but as the ratio of their respective values was not in any degree observed, the comparison between the two metals only augmented the general confusion. All traffick was nearly at an end. Proclamations were issued,

<sup>b</sup> Walpole's Collection, vol. I. p. 426.

<sup>c</sup> See the case stated at length in Lecture V.

<sup>d</sup> See Lord Liverpool on the Coins of the Realm, p. 86.

and laws were enacted, with the severest penalties, for the purpose of supporting the legal tender; but the consequence was then, as it always has been in cases of oppressive legislation, that evasion ran parallel with enactment, and permanent suffering followed upon temporary relief. It is true, indeed, that an attempt was made at Athens<sup>e</sup>, during a time of great public difficulty, to degrade the coinage by a considerable admixture of copper; but it is also true, that the attempt met with general reprobation, and was speedily followed by a return to the ancient standard. The specimens accordingly of Athenian silver now remaining, and which may fairly be considered as extending over all the valuable portion of Athenian history, though they cannot be assigned accurately to their respective dates, are of the highest degree of purity.

“The business of money,” says Locke<sup>f</sup>, “as in  
“all times, even in this our quicksighted age,  
“hath been thought a mystery; those employed  
“in the mint must from their places be supposed  
“to penetrate the deepest into it. It is no im-  
“possible thing to imagine that it was not hard,  
“in the ignorance of past ages, when money was  
“little, and skill in the turn of trade less, for

<sup>e</sup> See Lecture V.

<sup>f</sup> Locke's *Further Considerations, &c.* Works, vol. II.  
p. 122. 4to.

“ those versed in the business and policy of the  
“ mint to persuade a prince, especially if money  
“ were scarce, that the fault was in the standard  
“ of the mint, and that the way to increase the  
“ plenty of money was to raise (a well-sounding  
“ word) the value of the coin.” The practice,  
thus accounted for by Locke, has been adopted at  
intervals by all governments, modern as well as  
ancient, until they have been prevented by the in-  
fluence of commerce. The Athenians appear to  
have discovered the danger of the practice, even  
before their commercial habits would otherwise  
have compelled them to abandon it.

Connected with this superiority, and with the  
rude method of minting which prevailed in former  
times, was the further advantage possessed by the  
Athenian coin of being less exposed to wear from  
constant use, than is the case with the thinner  
lamina and the larger surface of a modern coin.  
Whether it were owing to the smaller degree of  
hardness in the metal they employed, or to their  
want of mechanical contrivances, or to their know-  
ledge that a compact and globular body is least  
liable to loss from friction, the Athenian coin was  
minted in a form more massive than our own, and  
much less convenient for tale or transfer, but  
better calculated to maintain its value unimpaired  
by the wear of constant circulation. And this  
advantage, whether foreseen by the Athenians or

not, and however exposed to countervailing inconvenience, may fairly be considered as one of the properties of a perfect coinage <sup>g</sup>.

But it is of importance to ascertain how far the Athenians adhered to their original standard in weight; as in this particular if they abstained from degrading their coin, it could not be owing to any want of skill in the management of metals, but solely to their adoption of just principles of exchange. And with this view it must be taken into our account, that however exact in weight the coins were intended to be on their first issuing from the mint, some inequalities could not possibly be avoided. "I found," says Matthew Raper <sup>h</sup>, "the heaviest of twenty new guineas of "the year 1768, fresh from the mint, to outweigh "the lightest  $1\frac{2}{3}$  grains." If this then were the case at a modern mint, conducted with the greatest mechanical exactness, and in conformity with scientific principles, we may reasonably allow greater inequalities to have existed in ancient times without any impeachment of their general

<sup>g</sup> A further advantage may seem to have belonged to the gold coin of the ancients, which was also of the utmost degree of purity. "It is well known now, and seems to have "been ascertained at an early period, that the purer the gold "is, the less consumption of it from friction arises in use." *Jacob on Prec. Met.* vol. I. p. 147.

<sup>h</sup> *Phil. Trans.* 1771. p. 466.

system. It must be remembered too, that our experiments are to be made upon coins which have undergone different degrees of use, and in which we might naturally expect that whilst some of them had but slightly deviated from the original standard, others would have suffered severely during a long and constant service. And yet of the 12 drachms described in the Hunterian Catalogue, and belonging apparently to very different periods, only one weighs less than 60 grains, the heaviest being  $66\frac{1}{2}$ . In the tetradrachms, the proper weight of which was probably 266 grains, and which would naturally undergo a greater loss from friction, the whole number described is 102; and 70 of these, belonging apparently to periods remote from each other, range over a difference of not more than 10 grains from the primitive standard<sup>i</sup>. Such then was the high degree of exactness and uniformity observed at the Athenian mint in the weight and fineness of their coins<sup>k</sup>.

<sup>i</sup> M. Letronne is of opinion that the silver coin of Athens was reduced in weight during the third century before the Christian era, and that the tetradrachm contained afterwards only 308 Paris grains, instead of the ancient quantity of 328. *Sur l'évaluation des Monnaies*, pp. 99, 128. It may readily be admitted that this alteration was made, as soon as Roman money became current in Greece, for the purpose of placing the drachma on the same level with the denarius.

<sup>k</sup> This exactness was not confined to Athens. "The di-

But it is a more remarkable property of their currency, that, with the exception of the small copper coinage, which was also too unimportant to affect the general principle, they confined themselves to one single species as a legal issue. Silver coins, descending from the tetradrachm to the quarter obol, were the only legal currency at Athens. The gold coins of foreign countries, being much employed in the operations of their commerce<sup>1</sup>, were also received freely in payments at the treasury, and in the larger dealings of their home-trade<sup>m</sup>; but they appear to have circulated according to their intrinsic value, their money-price being determined by some commercial regulation, and expressed in Athenian currency. If it be said that this practice would seem to imply a greater advancement in the arts of government, than we can reasonably suppose to have existed at so remote a period, we must reply, that there is not only the evidence of facts in its favour, but

“ drachmal gold of Philip and Alexander is about four grains  
 “ heavier than our guinea; and I never found the difference  
 “ between any two of them, that appeared to be perfect  
 “ and unworn, amount to two grains.” *Phil. Trans.* 1771.  
 p. 466.

<sup>1</sup> See Lecture V.

<sup>m</sup> In the *Plutus* of Aristophanes, (v. 816.) these foreign staters are represented as becoming so plentiful, that the slaves used them for their common pastimes:

στατήρησι δ' οἱ θεράποντες ἀρτιάζομεν  
 χρυσοῖς.

also that commerce was carried on in those times to an extent sufficient to account for the existence of still more enlightened practices, and that the confusion of prices occasioned by the use of a second species was clearly understood and predicted by their writers. "If any one should tell me," says Xenophon<sup>n</sup>, in speaking of the advantage of a silver currency, "if any one should tell me, that "gold is no less serviceable than silver, so far I "do not contradict him; but this I know, that if "gold coin becomes abundant, it sinks in its own "value, and raises the value of the silver."

I need not enlarge on the care that was taken to carry the money-scale to the lowest degree of subdivision, and to furnish coins for the smallest dealings of the people. The provision<sup>o</sup> indeed is of great importance, not merely to the comforts of the labouring classes, and through them to the community at large, but also to the interests of trade in general, as furnishing means for keeping the first elements of all prices at their proper level. Such a provision, however, is rarely wanting, and need not call for any peculiar commendation.

A more unusual characteristic was the perfect freedom allowed by the Athenians as to the exportation of their coin. Xenophon says, in the

<sup>n</sup> Xen. *περὶ προσοδ.* IV. 10.

<sup>o</sup> Sir J. Steuart, *Pol. Econ.* vol. III. p. 94.



same treatise<sup>p</sup>, from which I have already quoted, “ In most other countries merchants are obliged “ to take goods in payment, for their money will “ not pass current elsewhere: but at Athens they “ may have every sort of lading, and if they wish “ to take our coin, they are sure to be the gainers “ by it.” We meet also in Plato<sup>q</sup> and Polybius<sup>r</sup> with mention of a money circulating generally in Greece; and from many conspiring circumstances, and more especially from an anecdote recorded by Plutarch<sup>s</sup> in his Life of Lysander, we have reason to believe that this common money was the silver coinage of the Athenians<sup>t</sup>.

And this leads to a question of much interest in connexion with the proceedings of the Athenian mint. We might believe, from what has been already stated, that much attention was paid to the true principles of a currency, and we know from universal testimony that the fine arts were cultivated in Athens to a degree of refinement beyond the reach of other nations. To what cause then was it owing that the coins of Athens<sup>u</sup> should

<sup>p</sup> Περὶ προσ. III. 2.

<sup>q</sup> Plat. De Leg. lib. V. p. 742.

<sup>r</sup> Polyb. lib. VI. c. 49.

<sup>s</sup> Lys. c. 16.

<sup>t</sup> The two points on which I have been insisting, that silver was the only legal issue, and yet was allowed to be exported, seem to be implied at once in the following line of the Agamemnon: (959.)

*φθείροντα πλοῦτον ἀργυρώνητους θ' ὑφάς.*

<sup>u</sup> Eckhel D. N. v. II. p. 211.

have been executed throughout in a style of elegance and coarseness, at a time too when the coins of other districts, far inferior in science and reputation to Athens, were finished in the most perfect workmanship? The fact is certainly remarkable; and the only explanation that has hitherto been given of it may tend to illustrate still further the beneficial effects of commerce in its influence upon the Athenian mint<sup>x</sup>. The ancient coinage, says Eckhel, had recommended itself so strongly by its purity, and had become so universally known among Greeks and Barbarians by its primitive emblems, that it would have been impossible to have made any considerable change in the form or workmanship of the coin, without creating a great degree of suspicion against it, and eventually contracting its circulation. If this

<sup>x</sup> This explanation is repeated by lord Aberdeen in a paper contained in Walpole's Collection (vol. 1. p. 433), where the following case is given in confirmation of it: "A similar proceeding in the state of Venice throws the strongest light on the practice of the Athenians. The Venetian sechin is perhaps the most unseemly of the coins of modern Europe; it has long, however, been the current gold of the Turkish empire, in which its purity is universally and justly esteemed; any change in its appearance on the part of the Venetian government would have tended to create distrust." Any traveller who visited the mint at Milan in the year 1818 will remember that the government was then minting the rude crowns of Maria Theresa, because they still continued the medium for the trade of the Levant.

were actually so, the Athenians not only adhered to the true principles of a currency, but even sacrificed in their favour some of the strongest partialities they possessed.

The observations hitherto made have referred exclusively to the coinage of Athens, but they are also applicable, in their degree and proportion, to the smaller states of Greece, which cultivated habits of intercourse and commerce with their neighbours. The extensive trade, for instance, carried on between Sicily and Greece, and the many important places connected with the transit of it, might lead us to expect that we should find some traces of their intercourse in the structure or devices of their coins. And so strikingly is this the case, that didrachms<sup>y</sup> are met with in great abundance bearing the ancient Koph, or the Pegasus, of Corinth, but uniting with it the devices or legends of Syracuse and other trading towns in the neighbourhood, and corresponding so exactly with each other, that they are supposed to have been minted at Syracuse for the use of herself and all her sister and daughter colonies. And to so great an extent was this communication carried, that the emblems of Corinth and Syracuse are combined in many cases with those of the Epizephyrian Locri, of the Amphilocheian Argos, of Tauromenium, and of other towns, which

<sup>y</sup> Eck. D. N. v. II. p. 246.

had no original connexion whatever with them, being merely attracted by the common interest of trade.

Here then the inquiry into the regulations observed at the Athenian mint may terminate. But the subject acquires a greater interest, when it embraces the new forms of money created by the operations of commerce, and representing public or private credit. And though these further considerations do not necessarily form a part of my inquiry, belonging more properly to a treatise on commerce, than to a description of Athenian currency, they are at once too nearly allied to the subject, and too important in their nature, to be overlooked.

The system of banking pursued at Athens gave occasion to a new kind of money, constructed upon the credit of individuals or of companies, and acting as a substitute for the legal currency. In the time of Demosthenes<sup>z</sup>, and even at an earlier period, bankers appear to have been numerous, not only in Piræus, but also in the upper city; and it was principally by their means that capital, which would otherwise have been unemployed, was distributed and made productive. Athenian bankers<sup>a</sup> were, in many instances, ma-

<sup>z</sup> Dem. v. II. p. 1236. ed. Reiske.

<sup>a</sup> Lysias κατὰ Διογεν. Xen. de Rep. Ath. II. 8. Demosth. ὑπὲρ Φορμ.

nufacturers, or speculators in land, conducting the different branches of their business by means of partners or confidential servants, and acquiring a sufficient profit to remunerate themselves, and to pay a small rate of interest for the capital intrusted to them. But this was not the only benefit they imparted to the operations of commerce. Their ledgers were books of transfer, and the entries made in them, although they cannot properly be called a part of the circulation, acted in all other respects as bills of exchange. In this particular their banks bore a strong resemblance to modern banks of deposit. A depositor desired his banker<sup>b</sup> to transfer to some other name a portion of the credit assigned to him in the books of the bank; and by this method, aided, as it probably was, by a general understanding among the bankers, (or, in the modern phrase, a clearing house,) credit was easily and constantly converted into money in ancient Athens. “If you do not know,” says Demosthenes<sup>c</sup>, “that credit is the readiest capital for acquiring wealth, you know positively nothing.”

The spirit of refinement may be traced one step further. Orders were certainly issued by the government in anticipation of future receipts, and

<sup>b</sup> Demosth. *πρὸς Καλλικ.* v. II. p. 1236.

<sup>c</sup> Demosth. *ὑπὲρ Φορμ.* v. II. p. 958.

may fairly be considered as having had the force and operation of exchequer bills. They were known by the name of ἀνομολογήματα. We learn, for instance, from the inscription of the Choiseul Marble<sup>d</sup>, written near the close of the Peloponnesian war, that bills of this description were drawn at that time by the government of Athens on the receiver-general at Samos, and made payable, in one instance, to the paymaster at Athens, in another, to the general of division at Samos. These bills were doubtless employed as money on the credit of the in-coming taxes, and entered probably, together with others of the same kind, into the circulation of the period.

As the conclusion of this subject, I may now mention one remarkable characteristic of ancient manners, which will bring them strongly into contrast with the practice of our own times, and shew that, whatever might be the cause, the ancients did in fact deprive themselves of many means of advancing their condition. No acquirement is more indispensable in modern times than the art of writing. It has opened the most copious sources of social enjoyment, and created new kinds of labour for the proper distribution of them. It has facilitated, and therefore multiplied, the operations of commerce. It has introduced a

<sup>d</sup> Boeckh. Corp. Ins. v. I. p. 219.

new description of enactments into the penal code of nations. It has been made an auxiliary, and even a substitute, for the memory, in every department of life. Let us take, by way of instance, one single point in the relation in which it stands to commerce ; not its facilities for expressing wants, and communicating with distant countries ; not its necessity for the registry and continuation of transactions—purposes for which it certainly was employed in ancient times ;—but that invention of modern practice and legislation, by which a man's writing is made equally authentic with his actual presence, and his signature is become the expression of personal identity ; an invention by which a merchant or common dealer can invest a piece of writing with any portion of the actual or contingent value of his property, can legally convey to it the inviolability belonging to his own person, and can create for himself a kind of mercantile ubiquity. Now this invention, though understood in theory, and carried occasionally into practice, was totally unknown in the common dealings of the ancient world.

Nevertheless, the facts which have now been stated with respect to this important branch of public economy would appear to suggest a reflection on the comparative advancement of the ancients and the moderns, which may, I think, be extended with equal truth to many of the other

departments of political science. The moderns have undoubtedly carried the science into practical expedients and subdivisions of labour totally unknown in ancient times : but before we decide upon the wisdom of doing so, and much more before we commend modern statesmen at the expense of their predecessors, we must be satisfied that our expedients have not been forced upon us, as mere remedies for evils which were formerly unknown, and that our greater skill in the distribution of capital and of labour has not grown out of circumstances which were studiously and prophetically averted by the ancients. It will probably be found, the further we proceed in the comparison, that the whole question resolves itself into a balance of advantages, and that, the first elements of their character continuing the same, the ancients could not possibly have adopted our greater political refinements ; or if it were possible, would have been guilty of the greatest folly in attempting it.

It now remains that I should state to you briefly the course of investigation to be pursued in the following Lectures. It will first be necessary to consider at some length the difficulties thrown in our way by the nature and properties of coins themselves, by the length of time which has elapsed since the periods when the coins under consideration were issued, and by the frauds to



which during the whole of that interval they seem to have been exposed. These difficulties will appear to be so great, that it will then be necessary to illustrate, from actual cases, the advantages to be derived from numismatic testimony, and to limit, as far as may be, the proper extent and application of it. This portion of the subject will be included within two Lectures. Having afterwards treated of ancient coinage in general, I shall proceed to the consideration of Grecian coins, and more expressly of those of Athens. This will be followed by a general description of the Roman mint, and by a detailed examination of such medals, whether of the republic or the empire, as may seem the best calculated to promote the object of these Lectures—the illustration of history and literature.



## LECTURE II.

DIFFICULTIES of the subject—Capriciousness of the evidence derived from coins—Illustrated from Corinth, Elis, and Olynthus, on the one side; from Thasus and Dyrrachium on the other—Inconsistencies of ancient authors—Confusion arising from the records of private families—Illustrated from a Macedonian coin—From political views—Illustrated from the coins of Gelo and Hiero—From the difficulty of decyphering—Illustrated from a coin of Carausius—From the mistakes made at the mint—Illustrated from a coin of Titus—From the practice of restamping—Illustrated from a coin of Trajan—From ancient forgeries—Illustrated from coins of Verus and Caracalla—Recapitulation.

NUNQUAM ita quisquam bene subducta ratione ad vitam fuat,  
Quin res, ætas, usus semper aliquid adportet novi,  
Aliquid moneat, ut illa, quæ te scire credas, nescias,  
Et quæ tibi putaris prima, in experiundo ut repudies <sup>a</sup>.

AS applied to the interests of human life, the sentiment which I have expressed in the words of Terence is so constantly exemplified in practice, that some apology would seem to be required for attempting any further illustration of it. But however essential in reference to questions of present and future interest, the sentiment is applicable in part only, and by accident, to the investigation of the past. We have seen historians indeed, who seem to consider the knowledge of past events as still open to every variety of change, adopting the evidence which had been rejected by their predecessors, and estimating the value of a witness, not by the openness of his character, and his agreement with other testimony, but by the difficulty of discovering him, and the confusion created by his appearance. But such attempts must, from the nature of the case, be unsuccessful. They may be sufficient to throw a doubt upon the system they oppose, but the

<sup>a</sup> Ter. Ad. V. 4, 1.

evidence adduced by them is so far from being the main strength and business of the argument, that it seems to hang upon the skirts of it, as if the only object were to embarrass its operations, and to claim for itself the merit of a victory which it had not contributed to win.

Nevertheless, sure and unexceptionable as are the grounds of history in general, in that department of it with which we are at present concerned, the greatest uncertainty has constantly prevailed, and is likely to continue. The evidence presented by ancient coins is open to every kind of objection, carried too, in some instances, to the greatest possible extent, to which any kind of testimony is exposed. It is most capricious in its application, being abundant in regard to some places which are almost totally unknown in common history, and most sparing in regard to others of general notoriety; and yet coins may still be discovered in great quantities, and even in remote districts, which may change that inequality in any conceivable manner and degree. It labours under the disadvantages of fabulous devices, and forgotten languages, and evanescent figures; and when all these difficulties are overcome, it repays your search after it by giving you a remote conjecture. It wraps itself up in the associations of distant times, and requires that you should be provided with the aids of ancient learning to explain them;

and at last perhaps, when you think you have discovered its meaning and its value, it comes forth an undisputed forgery. But as the credibility of ancient coins is an inquiry of some importance, and will admit, in the course of it, of much and useful illustration, I shall treat it at considerable length in this and the following Lecture, at some times confining myself to examples, and at others entering into a more extended narrative, as the importance of the subject may seem to require. This only I will state by anticipation, that the study of ancient coins will not add many new facts, or lead to many new conclusions in the history of past times, but may still impart clearness and identity to what we have already learnt. It will not afford us any fresh information on secret plans of policy, or the rise and progress of public opinion; but it may certainly enable us to define and circumscribe what tradition has stated loosely, and to speak of individuals where history has made men act in masses. The difference is something like the case of an army of modern times, moving in enormous bodies, guided by some master impulse, and accomplishing one common purpose, but frequently involving its operations in mist and darkness, compared with the simplicity of Homer's warfare, with Achilles fighting for the dead Patroclus, and Ajax bidding defiance to the gods.

You will remember mention made in the first book of Thucydides of Corinthian drachms, where any one who was not able to go in person, was allowed to partake in the advantages of the settlers departing to Epidamnus, πεντήκοντα δραχμὰς κατὰ θέντα Κορινθίας<sup>b</sup>, and you would naturally expect, from the ancient fame of Corinth, and the rank it always held among the states of Greece, that the coins of that city, still remaining, would be numerous. The same expectation might naturally be formed respecting Elis, which had actually obtained an important place in the history of Grecian sculpture; and also respecting Olynthus, a seaport of the utmost consequence to Athenian commerce, and whose name has had the good fortune to attach itself to the eloquence of Demosthenes. Of these towns, and some others equally important, it has been generally supposed that there are but few coins extant<sup>c</sup>; whilst the coins of Thasus and Dyrrachium, of the smaller states of Magna Græcia, and of places in Asia Minor scarcely recognised in history, are known to be very abundant; and Sestini<sup>d</sup> mentions a rich collection, which consisted entirely of the coins of Parium in Mysia. To add to the capriciousness of such dis-

<sup>b</sup> Thuc. I. 27.

<sup>c</sup> Whether this supposition is correct with regard to Elis may be seen in the fifth Lecture.

<sup>d</sup> Lettere et Dissert. Contin. t. II. p. 55.



coveries, they have, in many instances, been made in places most unsuitable for them; coins of Thasus, for instance, having been found in great numbers in Transylvania; and gold coins of Trajan, Hadrian, and Faustina, in the most beautiful state of preservation, having been turned up by the plough, on the site of a Hindu temple, about a hundred miles distant from Madras<sup>e</sup>.

The notices moreover that we have obtained from ancient writers respecting the state of the coinage before their own times, have, for the most part, been either so scanty as to be of little value to us, or so inconsistent with fact, or with other authorities, as to throw a suspicion upon the little information that remained. Pliny the elder has given us a rapid sketch of the early coinage of Rome, which I shall have to consider hereafter, and which is totally incapable of explanation on any known principles of currency: and the same writer<sup>f</sup> has told us that Marius Gratidianus, a contemporary and friend of Cicero, was the first person who invented the art of assaying money; although we learn from Livy<sup>g</sup> that the Quæstors long before that time had tried Carthaginian silver, and found it wanting.

But the same Livy suggests to us another cause of confusion, which, originating in pride of birth,

<sup>e</sup> Asiatic Res. vol. II. §. 19.

<sup>f</sup> Nat. Hist. lib. XXXIII. c. 46.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. XXXII. c. 2.

and introducing spurious honours into the records of private families, made its way into public offices, and through them into the medals and monuments of the state. “*Vitiatam memoriam,*” says Livy<sup>h</sup>, “*funebribus laudibus reor, falsisque imaginum titulis, dum familia ad se quæque famam rerum gestarum honorumque fallente mendacio trahunt. Inde certe et singulorum gesta et publica monumenta rerum confusa.*” Or as Cicero has expressed it more pointedly in the Brutus<sup>i</sup>, “*his laudationibus historia rerum nostrarum facta est mendosior. Multa enim scripta sunt in iis quæ facta non sunt, falsi triumphi, plures consulatus, genera etiam falsa.*” This pride of birth then, with the legendary tales suggested by it, was not confined to the single occasion of a funeral, or to the inscriptions which were exhibited in the halls of private families, but might also be displayed in the titles and devices of the public money, whenever a proconsul was allowed to issue a new coinage for the use of his province, or the triumviri monetales sent forth their own insignia from the mint of Rome. I shall mention several instances of the kind hereafter, in connection with anecdotes recorded by ancient writers; but I select one for the present occasion, which is sufficiently marked, as a specimen of the whole class, to shew

<sup>h</sup> Liv. l. VIII. c. 40.

<sup>i</sup> C. 16.

the danger we incur of falling into great mistakes, and yet possesses other tokens, so distinct and intelligible, as to leave no doubt remaining in its own particular case<sup>k</sup>. We have coins bearing on the obverse the head of Alexander the Great, encircled with a diadem, together with the inscription ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ, and on the reverse a warrior on horseback, with the inscription ΚΟΙΝΟΝ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΩΝ. Now, were this the whole account that the coins in question afford us of themselves, we should probably have assigned them to some period in the history of Macedon connected with that illustrious conqueror. We might indeed conceive that the coins of Alexander would extend themselves as far as his conquests, and that, in acknowledgment of his talents and of their admiration, his successors would still retain his name and impress long after he was dead. We find too, even on a slight acquaintance with numismatic antiquities, that many cities of Greece and Asia did in fact adopt the badges chosen by him for the coins of Macedon, and that they continued to be in use to an advanced period of the Roman empire. Still if the coins, that I am considering, had given us no further tokens of their date, we should probably have assigned them to Macedon, without fixing upon any precise time in

<sup>k</sup> Sestini. Contin. tom. III. p. 36.

Grecian history as the exact period they belonged to. Fortunately we find, after the word MAKE-ΔΟΝΩΝ, other letters, which convey a reference to Roman history of the time of the empire, and beneath the figure of the horse the three Greek numerals EOC, expressing the date 275. Now, referring this date back to the battle of Actium, the epoch commonly adopted during the time of the empire, we are brought down to the year of Rome 998, corresponding with the year 245 of the Christian era, the precise period at which Philip the elder, who then occupied the throne of the Cæsars, was celebrating his recent victories in the east, and connecting them, as we may suppose, with the ancient fame of Alexander the Great. To complete the proof, if confirmation be wanting, we meet with a medal having the same reverse in all its particulars of inscription, device, and date, but bearing on the obverse the titles of this very Philip, with the head of a Roman emperor. So then these coins, which, from most of their tokens, might at first sight have been assigned to a much earlier period, were minted for the use of Macedon, about the middle of the third century after Christ, in obedience to the mandate of the emperor Philip, and displaying some alleged connexion between that emperor and the ancient conqueror of the east.

Connected with the difficulty already noticed,

but arising probably from different causes, was the practice which prevailed not only at Rome, but also in other places, of reissuing the coins or restoring the badges of antecedent monarchs. It appears<sup>1</sup> that Titus, Domitian, and Nerva made it a maxim of their policy to restore the monuments of their predecessors, and to reissue their coins for the purpose of obtaining reputation for themselves. They made the monarchy more acceptable to their subjects by presenting perpetually to them tokens of the great services which had been done to their country, whether in arts or in arms, by their former sovereigns. Trajan adopted the same maxim, but carried it still farther. Relying on the acknowledged wisdom and equity of his government, he did not hesitate to remind his subjects of the greatest names and the proudest periods of the republic, exhibiting on his coins the inscriptions and badges of the Æmilii, the Horatii, the Mamili, the Marcelli, and other consular families of Rome, and contented to inscribe his own imperial titles round them. In these indeed and other instances of Roman *restituti*, whenever the inscription is perfect, there is no difficulty created by them, as the word *restituit* is a sufficient explanation of their origin. It is only when the inscriptions of the two sides are partially obliterated

<sup>1</sup> See M. le Beau in the Memoirs of the French Academy, tom. XXIV. p. 203.

ated, and the one is considered as a continuation of the other, that these coins would lead us into important mistakes. But there are other instances where we have great reason to suppose that many and serious errors have been committed. Spanheim was the first to suggest that the coins bearing the impress of Gelo, of Hiero, and of Thero, who lived about 480 years before Christ, were really of a much later period; and Eckhel, in a dissertation on the subject<sup>m</sup>, has left us to infer that they are actually of Roman origin, minted for the use of Sicily after the invasion of the Romans, and intended to recommend the Roman government to its new subjects, by professing to hold forth the example of their ancient sovereigns. If this be the case, what becomes of the statement made by Dutens<sup>n</sup> on the authority of these coins, that the fine arts flourished in Sicily more than two centuries before they attained eminence in Greece?

But suppose the coin to be actually before us, and to be free, for aught we know or can conjecture, from any antecedent difficulties; we may yet meet with insuperable obstacles in our endeavours to decypher it. It cannot be supposed that a piece of metal (I speak especially of brass) can have remained for some centuries in the earth, exposed,

<sup>m</sup> Vol. I. p. 251.

<sup>n</sup> Explic. de quelques Médailles, pref. p. 2.

as has been the fate of a great number of ancient coins, to the influence of many corrosive agents, without presenting, when it comes to light, a variety of points and lines and colours, which had no place in the original fabric. However carefully then the incrustation may be removed, how can the anxious inquirer hope that the natural chemistry of so many ages will have left any traces of ancient workmanship? or if there are still some faint lines of the Grecian or the Roman die to be discovered, how can he convince himself that a greater number of them has not entirely perished? I need not dwell on the loss which might ensue from the omission of a single letter, or the portentous discovery that might be made from the introduction of any other in the place of it, especially in inscriptions where a single letter is made to represent a whole word. You will naturally be reminded of well-known instances, in which the science of the antiquary has been lampooned by ingenious men, constructing monstrous speculations on the most unpretending facts of common life; but I cannot refrain from mentioning an example connected with the early history of Britain, which, if it is not an illustration of the case I have been considering, will certainly belong to another cause of error that I shall shortly lay before you.

A silver coin of Carausius, who reigned in Britain, and was colleague with Diocletian and Max-

imian in the empire, was found more than a century ago at Silchester; and after being for some time in the possession of Dr. Meade, was presented by him to the cabinet of the king of France°. On the obverse of this coin we have the name and the head of the emperor Carausius; on the reverse, a female head in profile, within a garland; inscription ORIVNA AVG. Now, from the connexion which might naturally be supposed to exist between the female head and the inscription round it, Dr. Stukeley and others have satisfied themselves that this word ORIVNA was the name of a female of those times, and that such female was the wife of Carausius. On the other hand, the name is not to be found elsewhere in the whole compass of ancient history, and there is no evidence whatever from which we can certainly know that Carausius had an empress. To obviate the difficulty, Dr. Stukeley supposes the lady in question to have been of British origin, and therefore unknown to Roman annalists; and finds out a word in Welsh somewhat similar in sound, and denoting “whiteness,” or “fairness,” which, he thinks, might easily have become the name of a British female. Another writer, whose gravity I should suppose to be assumed, had I not found that his paper was thought deserving of a grave

° Dr. Stukeley, Palæ. Brit.



refutation, fancied that ORIVNA was an ancient goddess, of the same nature with the constellation Orion, but of the other sex; and displayed some learning in his endeavours to connect the influence of the stars with the history of Carausius. But it is probable, after all, that this ORIVNA is simply a mistake for the word FORTVNA; and the more so, as we actually find the inscription FORTVNA AVGVSTI on other medals of Carausius. Of this Dr. Stukeley was well aware, and meets it by observing, that the female head in question did not appear to him to bear about it any of the known characteristics of Fortune. But Dr. Stukeley, in a much greater degree than his brethren, had a passion for the marvellous, and a habit of attaching himself to opinions, which were beyond the boundaries of proof.

Connected with the case I have mentioned, is another cause of confusion, arising from the errors and omissions that were made at the ancient mints. It is not surprising, for the coins of modern nations will furnish us with many parallel cases, that the same word should be written differently, even at the same period, especially as the die would constantly require to be renewed; but if this were all, no person of common experience would be likely to be misled by it. There could be no mistake respecting Egypt, even though the Greek word were sometimes written ΑΙΓΙΠΤΟΣ;

or in the word **FIDES**, even though the first vowel were sometimes written **E**; or in **OPITIMVS**, written incorrectly for **OPTIMVS**. But this is not all. There are instances of inscriptions utterly unconnected with the devices they accompany, and of others again that admit of no explanation for the strange collection of letters they present to us, unless we suppose that the graver was negligent in his work, and joined together, and perhaps on the occurrence of some common word, fragments of two different inscriptions. The case is certainly conceivable, and I will mention one example of it, without dwelling on any of the other varieties of error, which might be traced gradually downward from the blending of two different inscriptions to the misspelling of a single word. To any one desirous of further materials on this branch of the subject, a dissertation of Froelich, in his *Quatuor Tentamina*, will supply abundant information. We have a brass of Titus, which bears on its reverse the words **AERES AVGVSTI**, with the figure of a female holding a balance in her right hand. M. de Peyresc, as we learn from the *Memoirs of the French Academy*<sup>p</sup>, supposed the word **AERES** to be a mistake for the word **CERES**, which is certainly to be found on other coins of the same emperor; forgetting

that the female figure that accompanies it is certainly not the goddess of Plenty, but of Justice. M. de Boze, however, persuaded himself that *æres* was at one time used for *æs*, as *plebes* was for *plebs*, confirming his opinion by several ingenious observations, and supposing the obsolete word to be retained only to denote an imaginary being, the goddess of the mint, such as might well be represented by the figure with the balance. Now it happens that in the same year in which this coin was struck, were minted two sets of coins of the same emperor, the one bearing AEQVITAS AVGVST with a figure of Justice, the other CERES AVGVST with a figure of Plenty. The graver, therefore, says Eckhel, had cut the word AEQVITAS as far as its second letter, and then unwittingly going on from the same letter in the word CERES, blended together the two inscriptions.

After the same manner it is not unusual to meet with coins occupying the same place among coins in general, which is held by codices palimpsesti, or rescripti, among ancient MSS. You are well aware that MSS. are often found, in which a monkish legend, for instance, has been written on some half-obliterated classic, so that sentences of Cicero might discover themselves in the midst of the wonders of martyrology, like granite cropping out in a stratum of chalk, or like Æneas astonish-

ing Deiphobus by his appearance amongst the shades :

. . . . . quæ te fortuna fatigat

Ut tristes sine sole domos, loca turbida, adires ?

In the same manner there are coins, where the impressions of different periods, and even remote countries, are blended together, so as to embarrass the inquirer with strange devices and incongruous titles. In all the mints of antiquity, where the impression was made by the hammer, and might require repeated blows to give it sufficient prominence, cases would occur where the flan, or piece of metal, might be shaken from its proper place during the operation, and so receive repeated and confused impressions from its die. Instances of this kind are not uncommon; but they are likely to be useless, rather than perplexing. The case I am now concerned with is different both in its origin and in its importance. As in the modern world there are reasons for melting coin back into bullion, and making it a mere article of merchandise, so also there were reasons in ancient times for effacing the original impressions of the coins, and giving them new inscriptions and devices. More especially at those periods when there was a rapid succession to the throne of the Cæsars, and each emperor obtained possession of it by the overthrow of an unpopular predecessor, their coins also partook in the confusion

created by the strange vicissitudes of the times. When a general was ambitious of the purple, and before he had obtained possession of it, it would be necessary for him to have large sums of money at his disposal, and his bold designs would seem likely to be promoted if he stamped them with his own effigy. This was done, as we learn from Tacitus<sup>q</sup>, by Vespasian at Antioch, among the first preparations that he made for gaining possession of the throne; and we may hereafter see reason for understanding why, as Tacitus also informs us, the issue consisted entirely of gold and silver. In such cases, together with metal which had never yet been under the die, coins of earlier date, and of all descriptions, were brought to the mint, and whenever the size and other circumstances would admit of it, were placed without alteration beneath the hammer, and reissued with their new impression. I might occupy you with many examples of this case; but the mention of Antioch and the recollections of Judæa remind me of a singular one, which has been well illustrated by Barthelémy and Eckhel<sup>r</sup>, and is a remarkable instance of the practice I am noticing. It was originally a silver coin of Trajan, and traces are still perceptible of the head of that emperor on the

<sup>q</sup> Hist. II. 82.

<sup>r</sup> Ac. Insc. tom. III. p. 184. Eckh. vol. II. p. 471.

one side, and of some of his titles on the other ; but it was afterwards stamped with Hebrew devices and Hebrew letters, and is believed to have been reissued by Simeon Barchocebas, when the Jews endeavoured to re-establish themselves as an independent state, in the days of Hadrian. The history of this coin, if we were at all able to follow it, would lead us among subjects of the deepest interest, and through a most eventful period.

The only remaining cause of confusion which I shall mention in my present Lecture, arises from the fabrications of ancient forgers. The punishment of death was denounced by the laws of Solon against the crime of forgery, and Demosthenes<sup>s</sup>, from whom we obtain our knowledge of the fact, informs us that the same punishment was inflicted in his own times. The crime of forgery was visited by the same punishment among the Romans; and in order to increase to their utmost extent the dangers of the offence, such temptations were offered for the detection of the offender, that, in the later periods of the empire, slaves were invited to inform against their masters<sup>t</sup> with a promise of the Roman franchise. But it is not necessary to adduce further evidence of such a practice. We

<sup>s</sup> Demosth. *con. Timoc.* ad fin. p. 765 ; et *ad Lept.* ad fin. p. 508.

<sup>t</sup> *Cod. Theod. lib. IX. tit. 21. §. 2.*

need only admit the existence of falsehood at all periods of the world, and we cannot question the coexistence of that especial form of it, which is calculated to relieve the most pressing wants, and is suggested by the most evident temptations. A more important consideration for us is, how far such forgeries can be supposed likely to embarrass the study of antiquities? We might meet with spurious coins in considerable numbers, and we might immediately be led to reflect on the perplexities they occasioned in the currency of ancient times. But if from the quantity of them they should appear to have issued, not from the retreats of private *falsarii*, but from the public mint of a fraudulent government, what reason could there be for supposing that such a currency would be less accurate in its dates and incidents, and less available for the purposes of history, than other contemporaneous coin, however genuine? Or again, if we suppose them to be the issue of private forgery, why, even then, should we expect them to be inaccurate in those intelligible matters of inscription and device, where every one could be a judge of the mistake, and mistake might so easily be avoided? To these inquiries we might answer sufficiently with the admitted fact, that whenever a denarius<sup>u</sup> has been opposed to our

<sup>u</sup> Eck. vol. I. p. 117. Prol.

common authorities in history, chronology, or general literature, it has, in most instances, been found to contain a heart of copper under an external covering of silver. Of the vast quantity of spurious coins issued in the times of the Flavian emperors, numbers of which may be seen in every extensive cabinet, Eckhel<sup>x</sup> observes, “Hujus in-  
“genii numos qui volet in scribenda historia cri-  
“tica vades adhibere, etsi certæ sint antiquitatis,  
“is profecto historiam veram consarcinabit, sed  
“talem, qualem Lucianus per jocum commentus  
“est.” And, indeed, if we confine ourselves for the moment to the case of the Roman empire, we shall find in it circumstances sufficient to give rise to extensive forgeries, and to make it probable that great mistakes would be committed by them. From an early period, apparently before the commencement of the empire, the right of coinage, which had previously been exercised by many towns of Italy, was restricted to the capital; and in the time of Tiberius it seems to have been taken away in like manner from all the western provinces. It is easy to conceive then that either rapacious officers or private individuals might prepare a spurious currency for their distant settlements; and, if so, that they would be less skilful in the general execution of the coin, and less ac-

<sup>x</sup> Eck. vol. VI. p. 396.



curate in those successions of consul, tribune, emperor, which form, for the same piece of money, so many different attestations of its date. Jerome makes mention of a cave in Upper Egypt with the implements of coining discovered in it, which was believed to have been the resort of Roman forgers in the times of Antony and Cleopatra<sup>y</sup>. It is a fact recorded by Dio Cassius<sup>z</sup>, that Caracalla issued a spurious coinage for the use of Rome, but was compelled to mint genuine pieces for the Barbarians, who were pensioned by him. It is not improbable that those same Barbarians, who were so skilful in detecting forgery, sent the Roman denarii back again in exchange for what they wanted, but in a new and adulterated form. We have reason to know that the Dacians had at a much earlier period been practised in the art of forging, and we may confidently ascribe to them many of the spurious coins that we meet with of Philip of Macedon.

But it is time for me to shew, by an example, that difficulties have actually been created by the frauds of ancient *falsarii*. Froelich has noticed a coin of Lucius Verus, the colleague of Marcus Aurelius, bearing the name and profile of Verus on the obverse, but assigning to him on the other

<sup>y</sup> See Eckhel, vol. I. Proleg. p. 114.

<sup>z</sup> Hist. LXXVII. 14.

side titles and terms of office which, we have reason to know, never belonged to him. He is styled, for instance, Pontifex Maximus, a title which, at that time, was given only to Aurelius; and Pater Patriæ, which even Aurelius did not assume till after the death of Verus. On closer examination, and comparison with other coins, we find that the reverse is in fact an exact copy of the titles and honours of Commodus, as he held them eighteen years after the death of Verus, and that the forgery has brought together the inscriptions of two different emperors. Another instance, noticed by the same writer, is of a coin of Caracalla, where he is styled Britannicus on the one side, and on the other is given the date of a year, at which Caracalla had not yet departed for Britain, and had no claim to the title of Britannicus. The mistake in this instance is of the same nature with the last, and both the coins are found, on examination, to be of copper, overlaid with a covering of silver.

The causes of confusion, then, which I have already noticed as belonging to the study of ancient coins, are, the great but capricious variety of them, the perplexed and inconsistent accounts of them received from ancient authors, the anachronisms introduced upon them by the vanity or the policy of those who minted them, the extreme difficulty in many cases of deciphering them, the

mistakes committed by the ancient *monetarii*, the practice of stamping coins with a new die without effacing the old impression, and lastly, the great extent to which the ancients carried the crime of forgery.



## LECTURE III.

FARTHER difficulties of the subject—Modern forgers—Forgers of the sixteenth century—More recent forgers—Different methods of fabrication—By changing the inscription—By giving a new impression to one side—By interchanging two reverses—By cutting new dies after ancient models—By contriving improbable accidents—Greek coin of Cicero—Proper use of coins as evidence—The object and extent of it—Examples from the coins of Thurium—From Roman coins bearing the letters S·C—From a coin of Larissa, referring to a passage of the Iliad—From a coin of Agathocles—From a coin of Himera.

THE difficulties I have already noticed, as embarrassing the study of ancient coins, and diminishing their value in the elucidation of ancient history, might appear sufficient to deter us from any lengthened prosecution of the subject. But the most formidable difficulty still remains, and is of a nature calculated, beyond any that I have mentioned, to throw suspicion upon all numismatic testimony. The *falsarii* of ancient times have been followed and surpassed by modern forgers. There certainly was inducement enough to coin a spurious drachma or denarius, when it was still to be used as common money; even though the profit on each separate piece was small, and the danger was considerable. But when it ceased to be the money of common circulation, and was purchased for the cabinets of the curious; when it became an article of costly luxury, and all legal penalties were at an end respecting it; the inducement to fabricate it was increased in an enormous degree. We find accordingly that, independently of those common frauds whose existence may be traced at all periods, there are certain times and names of forging which are peculiarly distinguished in the modern history of ancient coins. Omitting, then, all mention of the

common impostures practised equally in all the countries of Europe, and in many parts of Asia, wherever collections of ancient coins are made, or travellers are to be found inquiring for them, I will merely notice a few of the most notorious among modern *falsarii*, and then pass on to describe the degree of excellence attained by them. Fortunately for me, the subject has been fully treated, though with different degrees of skilfulness, by Rinck, Beauvais, Eckhel, Sestini, and several others, and my only employment will be to select and abridge.

The two artists, known under the name of the two Paduans<sup>a</sup>, flourished about the middle of the sixteenth century, and forged many coins, especially of the twelve first emperors, which are as well known among ancient medals, as Livy was among ancient authors, for the Patavinity of their style. At subsequent periods, Dervieux at Florence, Carteron in Holland, and Cogornier at Lyons, enjoyed the same fraudulent preeminence. Ennery mentions a person of the name of La Roche<sup>b</sup>, who lived at an obscure village in the south of France, and forged some of the most remarkable medals of a well-known French col-

<sup>a</sup> Vico mentions seven other artists living at the same time, who were skilful in the imitation of ancient medals. Among them was Benvenuto Cellini.—*Delle Medaglie*, p. 67.

<sup>b</sup> See Eckh. vol. I. p. 119. Prol. note.



lector; and in more modern times we have had Weber at Florence, Galli at Rome<sup>c</sup>, Becker on the Rhine, Caprara at Smyrna, and several others, who seem to have acquired more reputation by their skill than they have lost by their dishonesty, and have obtained for a work of imposture the name of an ingenious and elegant invention.

The first method was to retouch an ancient coin by the aid of the graver. This was done, not merely to give a greater degree of precision or prominence to the actual lines and letters of an ancient coin, but to obtain for it a value to which it had no claim whatever, by changing the inscription altogether, and transferring it from a name, the medals of which were abundant, to one, of which they were hitherto unknown, or at least uncommon. It has been found to be most easily practised upon the brasses of the Roman emperors, particularly those which were minted in the eastern provinces; and cases accordingly have occurred in which a Claudius has been found converted into an Otho, a Domna into a Didia Clara, and a Macrinus into a Pescennius<sup>d</sup>. To make, for instance, a coin of Pertinax: choose out a well-conditioned Marcus Aurelius, particularly one where the reverse bears a *consecratio*, a ceremony

<sup>c</sup> See Hemin. Elémens, vol. I. p. 276.

<sup>d</sup> Eck. vol. I. p. 124. Prol.

which both those emperors had the fortune to undergo; then apply your graver to the obverse, make the beard and nose of Aurelius a little more decided, alter his inscription according to your wants, conceal the traces of your graver by a false verdigris or varnish,—the transformation is complete, and a worthless Aurelius becomes an invaluable Pertinax.

There are, however, difficulties belonging to this kind of fraud, which the artist cannot reasonably expect to overcome. Supposing that the actual lines and figures of the coin have been such as to allow of the intended change, without exposing the contrivance of it on the first examination; still the contrast between the native characters of the coin, and the lines of the trim and stiff imposture is much too great to escape detection. This method, therefore, which was at one time the favourite practice of the Italians, appears now to have fallen into disuse.

It requires, however, a touch of extreme precision, and an eye of exquisite discernment, to judge rightly in all cases of this kind, and more particularly to distinguish between the genuine rust of antiquity and the modern varnish.

Another method of augmenting the value of an ancient coin is, to retain one of its impressions in its original state, but to submit the other face to a new die, and so to obtain for the coin the ap-

pearance of being at once genuine and unique. Thus a Julius Cæsar has had its reverse impressed with the well-known tidings, *Veni, vidi, vici*; and a Hadrian, in like manner, with the help of a modern die, has borne the legend, *Expediit Judaica*: but here again there is a striking contrast between the two sides of the coin, in all those nice distinctions, by means of which a practised eye can identify the characters of any given time or country.

In order, therefore, to increase still farther the difficulty of distinguishing between a genuine and a spurious coin, the contrivance has been adopted of cutting two genuine coins asunder, and interchanging their reverses. It is plain, that in this instance, by effecting a new combination of titles and devices, the value of the coin would be greatly enhanced in the estimation of the collector, and all his common criteria, connected with the metal and the workmanship, might be dexterously eluded. And, lest it should not be possible to join the two portions together in such a manner as to evade the vigilance of his eye, whilst it was cautiously exploring the edge of the coin, the strata-gem has been tried of setting the one portion within the other, and so presenting the line of junction, not at the edge, but upon the surface. Coins of undoubted antiquity are frequently found with such a circle or rim upon them, and this fact

increases in a great degree the difficulty of detecting the kind of fabrication we are now considering. It is only the keen and practised eye of an adept, searching the suspected outline with a finely-pointed instrument, comparing the two surfaces with each other, and aided by an extensive acquaintance with ancient literature, that can be sufficient to detect a fraud presenting so many of the tokens of truth. The two surfaces may seem to be precisely of the same ancient metal; they may have been united together in such a manner as to appear to be inseparable; and if the artist have been prudent in his choice, some new fact may be alleged, which cannot easily be refuted, because all history is silent respecting it. The spurious coin may be considered as a genuine relic of antiquity, some learned dissertation may be written, with much collateral evidence, on the important fact disclosed by it, and some time may finally elapse before the imposture is exposed.

Other artists, however, more adventurous, and possessing a more intimate acquaintance with the practices and the literature of the ancients, have ventured to make new dies and to issue new coins for the admiration of the curious. The methods previously mentioned were practised generally on brasses, as affording a greater variety for such changes, and admitting of the disguise of varnish to imitate the rust of antiquity; but the method now

considered has been adopted in the case of gold and silver, where the number was comparatively small, and a false varnish could not be employed. And in order to elude discovery, the artist in many instances exercised the greatest discernment in the coins that he took, whether as models or only as guides, for the formation of his own die, in the preparation of the metal, in the management of the hammer, and in bringing about the accidents, such as clefts or other imperfections, which frequently occurred in ancient times during the process of minting. Many of the fabrications indeed made in this manner have been so coarse and unskilful, that they have never obtained a place in any distinguished cabinet; but there are others, on the contrary, so ably executed, that they have perpetually been subjects of debate, and have given rise to a large body of evidence, not to be found in all other branches of knowledge, under the name of disputed testimony. By the aid of dealers, coins of this and other doubtful characters have been taken to places, which appeared to be the most remote from all means of fabrication; and some convenient adventure has been contrived for the discovery of them. M. Hennin became acquainted with a jeweller in Italy, whom he knew to be a man of considerable information, although he readily purchased many of the coins discarded by Hennin himself as worth-

less. This jeweller had in fact established himself at Tunis, and gave a new value to the discarded coins, by burying them among the ruins of Carthage, and then by dexterous surmises enabling some unwary traveller to discover them. Imagine some lettered Englishman seated, as he fancies, on the same stone on which Marius sat, gazing, as he believes, on coins which, till he had the good fortune to disinter them, had never seen the light since the days of Scipio, and then returning homeward to discover that fraud is often skilful, and honesty as often credulous.

I have mentioned some of the principal methods by which modern *falsarii* have embarrassed the study of ancient coins, selecting those methods especially which would impair the value of them in their connection with ancient history. And perhaps it would appear from the whole survey, that in a subject, where so much is avowedly imposture, no one portion can escape without injury to its reputation. And this too the rather, because to common enquirers the coin itself is inaccessible, and their knowledge of it must be obtained through the medium of writers, who might on their part be inaccurate, or even be determined to practise deception upon their readers. We have, for instance, explanations afforded to us in the works of Hardouin, which seem to depend entirely on the most improbable conjectures, and

coins recorded and described by Goltz, of which it is now commonly believed that they never had existence.

But before I quit the subject I will notice, by way of example, a coin which might naturally be expected to create much interest, and has been held by many numismatic writers to be invaluable; but which is to many others an object of the greatest suspicion. It is a Greek coin of Cicero, bearing the reputed head of the orator himself, and purporting to be minted at Magnesia. The history of this coin has been given by Paciaudi in his *Animadversiones Philologicæ*<sup>e</sup>; from which we learn that in the year 1598 it was offered to Orsini, more commonly known as Fulvius Ursinus, by a dealer at Bologna, and was purchased by him at a high price, after much and anxious negociation. It passed afterwards, on the death of Ursinus, into the Farnese collection, but without appearing to have been acknowledged as genuine by its former owner. A head of Cicero, taken from this coin, was prefixed to several learned works, and more especially to the edition of Cicero published at Leyden by Gronovius<sup>f</sup>. Since the time of Paciaudi another coin of the same die has been noticed by Winkelman, and a third has come into the possession of Cousinery, a

<sup>e</sup> P. 52.

<sup>f</sup> See Eck. vol. V. p. 328.

celebrated French collector. Other coins bearing the head of Cicero, but from different dies, are admitted on all sides to be forgeries, and the three coins in question, in addition to other indications of fraud, labour under the suspicious fact of their having all come to light in the neighbourhood of Rome, though purporting to be minted in Asia Minor.

Nevertheless, great and perplexing as are the difficulties that beset us in the application of ancient coins to the purposes of history, we must remember that the assistance to be expected from them was confined, *in limine*, within very narrow limits, and that whatever skill and knowledge may have been employed in forging them, the same degree of skill, and probably a greater degree of knowledge, have been exerted in ascertaining their real value. I have already stated that ancient coins cannot prudently be used to add new facts or conclusions to our knowledge, but only to confirm, or to particularize, what history has already taught us; and, confined within these limits, the advantages to be derived from them may be illustrated by the clear and substantial vision, which a well-adjusted lens conveys to an imperfect sight. The distant objects of history, which hitherto had passed before us as shadows or chimaëras, become clear and intelligible facts; and the events of more recent times, however con-



fused they were as parts of a general narrative, stand forth distinct and identical, like friends recognized after a long absence. We must remember too, that the very knowledge of these difficulties presupposes the power of disentangling them ; that the skill and ingenuity of fraud have been followed step by step through all their windings, and wherever they have given birth to new devices, have as readily suggested some fresh caution or contrivance for exposing them. Even when all the arts of fraud have been exhausted, and mechanism has been assisted by learning in the business of delusion, there still remains on the other side that eye, at once keen and cautious, which seems to have converted a long experience into a quick perception. As in works of music a fine and practised ear can discern by tokens imperceptible to common organs the difference between a genuine master and the most able imitator, so too an antiquary of native talent, grown prudent from long use, and enlightened by various knowledge, has acquired for his pursuits a power of intuition, which fraud cannot easily elude, and ignorance cannot possibly comprehend.

But the best demonstration I can lay before you of the usefulness of these studies, and the extent to which they can reasonably be carried in the investigation of ancient history will be the examples which I shall have to adduce in every part

of my inquiry. For the present they will be selected without any other view to arrangement than merely to afford relief and variety to each other. They will most of them moreover be taken from those less frequented parts of history which will not come under our especial review hereafter; and on that account perhaps they will appear to be less satisfactory than the rest. But it will, I think, be sufficiently shewn at present, and it will be amply shewn hereafter, that ancient coins may clear up the dark expressions of ancient authors; may mark out epochs at which events actually occurred; may authenticate ancient records, on which much doubt had been expressed; may establish the proper order of confused occurrences; may suggest explanations in cases of acknowledged difficulty; and may act as valid and conclusive testimony where history has compelled us to remain in doubt. These are among the peculiar services which the study of ancient coins will be found by example to have imparted to us; its general province will be to go on concurrently with ancient history, in some instances giving clearness and precision to the statements of its companion, in others obtaining strength and substance for its own conjectures.

The interest imparted to the history of Thuri-um by the settlers who removed thither from Athens, carrying among them two such adven-

turers as Herodotus and Lysias, will be my reason for selecting it as the first subject of illustration. Some of its minuter circumstances have been drawn out in the well-known Dissertation on Phalaris; but the brief outline necessary for our present purpose is obtained exclusively from Diodorus Siculus. The people of Sybaris, on the bay of Tarentum, were conquered, and their city was overthrown, by the Crotoniats about the year 500 B. C.<sup>g</sup> About fifty-eight years afterwards a body of Sybarites endeavoured to rebuild the city, and after six years of dubious possession were again expelled by their ancient enemy. The exiles called in the aid of settlers from Athens and the Peloponnese, and in the year 444 B. C. laid the foundations of Thurium, near the site of the ancient Sybaris, taking the name of their new city from a fountain in its neighbourhood. The discordant members of this new community did not long continue to act in concert. The foreign settlers being superior in numbers, and being treated with indignity by the native Sybarites, conspired against them, and having put them to the sword, formed a new constitution for their adopted country. Such are the brief annals of the place, as they are derived from Diodorus, and confirmed in their general outline by other historians.

<sup>g</sup> Diod. l. XI. c. 90, &c.

What then is its numismatic history? We have several coins of Sybaris, bearing in the form of their brief inscription and in their workmanship the strongest evidence of high antiquity; so that we may fairly assign them to a period at least five centuries before the Christian era. The constant device of these coins, appearing in some instances on both their faces, and in all shewing that it was the acknowledged cognizance of Sybaris, is *Bos stans et respiciens*. The next coins to be noticed, as belonging to the place, are more recent, as we may judge from the form of their letters, and their highly finished style of workmanship; and, taken on the analogy of coins in general, they might be assigned to a period not much anterior to the time of Philip and Alexander. But from these we find that the devices of the place have undergone an important change. The ancient cognizance of Sybaris is now of secondary consequence, and has given way on one face of the coin to the *Caput Palladis* the well-known badge of Athens. The inscription too is, in one instance, the abbreviated word Sybaris, in another a similar abbreviation of the newly contracted name Thurium. So then these coins strictly mark the period when the natives and the foreigners were living together in compact, endeavouring to conciliate each other by mutual concessions, and each party preserving tokens of

its hereditary attachments. The next set of coins is distinguished by a minuteness of ornament, which marks them decidedly as the most recent of the three; and these coins, in perfect accordance with our narrative, bear no memorials of the ancient Sybaris. The inscription in every instance is of Thurium, the *Caput Palladis* is predominant, and the ancient cognizance of the bull is no longer *stans et respiciens*, but *irruens et cornupeta*. Doubtless, on the change of constitution made by the final expulsion of the natives, the heralds were directed to provide a difference for the bearings of the republic; and, after the punning manner of their brethren, they found in the meaning of the word *θουρίδων*, a reason for the difference they adopted, “a bull running and butting.”

But the parallel does not terminate here. It cannot be supposed that a colony consisting of adventurers from every part of Greece would long continue to acknowledge the supremacy of Athens. We learn, in fact, from Diodorus<sup>h</sup>, that after the government was settled, the republic flourished, owing to the fertility of the soil and the care that was taken to treat all emigrants alike; and that afterwards, when Athens and other powers of Greece began to claim them as a dependency,

<sup>h</sup> L. XII. capp. 11 et 35.

they boldly refused to acknowledge any other founder or patron than the deity of Delphi. And what say the coins? Some of them, which seem to have been minted when the republic was yet scarcely free from its ancient habits, retain the badge of Athens, but some also bear the emblems of Ceres, the tokens of agricultural prosperity, and others are impressed with the head and insignia of Apollo.

My next example is taken from the coinage of Rome<sup>i</sup>. It has been the prevailing opinion of antiquaries, that when Augustus became emperor, he reserved for himself and his successors the right of coining gold and silver, and left the brass money under the direction of the senate. That such an arrangement was actually adopted seems to be implied in the following inscription found at Rome: “*Officinatores monetæ aurariæ argentariæ Cæsaris<sup>k</sup>,*” from which we may infer that the two more precious metals, and those two only, were minted by the emperor. The same inference may also be derived from a passage of Dio, which states that the senate, from the hatred they bore to the memory of Caligula, ordered all the brass money stamped with his image to be recoined<sup>l</sup>; for we can have no doubt that they would have

<sup>i</sup> Eck. D. Num. vol. I. p. 73. Prol.

<sup>k</sup> See Grut. vol. I. p. 70. Ins. I.

<sup>l</sup> Dio, l. LX. c. 22.

included gold and silver money in their edict, if they had possessed any authority over it. I have already mentioned from Tacitus, that Vespasian minted gold and silver before he was acknowledged at Rome as emperor; and we can easily discover his reason for abstaining from minting brass money, if the right of doing so belonged exclusively to the senate. Strong however as this testimony appears to be, it has been maintained by several writers, and more especially by Morcelli<sup>m</sup>, an authority of the highest order in the science of antiquities, that the senate alone possessed the right of minting money in all the several metals. Let us see then what assistance can be obtained from the evidence of coins. Now it is the most remarkable fact connected with the coins of Rome, from the days of Augustus to those of Gallienus, that the brasses, with few exceptions, bear the letters S·C upon them; the gold and silver, with as few exceptions, and those few readily explained, are without them. It is moreover the universal opinion that the two letters denote the words *senatus consulto*; and though several other methods have been tried of explaining those words in their reference to the Roman mint, no one appears to be so satisfactory as the distinction which assigns all brass coins to the edict of the senate,

<sup>m</sup> De Stylo, l. I. p. 223.

and leaves the gold and silver to the prerogative of the emperor. It is also a remarkable fact, and one which would imply the existence of divided rights in the Roman coinage, that we sometimes meet with gold and silver coins of an emperor in considerable numbers, when the brasses of the same emperor are extremely rare. Taking, for instance, the short and turbulent reign of Otho, it is natural to suppose that the three metals would be issued in their usual proportion; or if there were any difference, that the more precious metals would be in smaller quantities. The fact, however, is, that we have many gold and silver coins of this reign, but not a single genuine brass of it, issued from the Roman mint, has hitherto been found. But I will mention another fact of minute coincidence, and more remarkable than the last. Albinus, we know, was acknowledged and proclaimed as Cæsar by the emperor Severus, but was afterwards, on proclaiming himself Augustus, defeated by him and put to death. Now we meet with gold, silver, and brass coins indiscriminately of Albinus described as Cæsar, and we might also expect all these coins to be minted with such a title on them, as it was acknowledged equally in his own province and by the authorities at Rome: again, we frequently meet with gold and silver coins of the same Albinus described as Augustus, but in no instance with a coin of brass, giving



that title to him; and this too might be expected, if we merely suppose that he exercised the privilege belonging to the office he had usurped, and cautiously left to the senate, for the purpose of conciliating them, a privilege which was exclusively their own. And these facts will, I think, be sufficient to shew the value of numismatic testimony in a point of disputed history.

My next instance<sup>n</sup> is in illustration of some lines of Homer. You will remember the fond language addressed by Hector to Andromache<sup>o</sup>:

*καί κεν ἐν Ἀργεὶ εὐῶσα, πρὸς ἄλλης ἱστὸν ὑφαίνοις,  
καί κεν ὕδωρ φορέοις Μεσσηϊδος ἢ Ὑπερείης,  
πόλλ' ἀεκαζομένη.*

Now it has been a common opinion, even among older writers, that Homer is speaking here of Argos in the Peloponnese, and endeavours have been made to discover in that neighbourhood the two fountains, by whose waters Andromache was doomed to weep in her captivity. But these endeavours have been unsuccessful. It is well known too, from Pindar<sup>p</sup> and other authors, that the fountain of Hyperia was in the town of Pheræ in Thessaly; and we can have little doubt that Homer in this passage, as elsewhere, is referring to

<sup>n</sup> Eck. vol. II. p. 148.

<sup>o</sup> Iliad. VI. 456.

<sup>p</sup> Pyth. IV. 122.

the Pelasgian Argos, which, according to Strabo<sup>q</sup>, was the district at the foot of Pindus, containing, among other places, the towns of Pheræ and Larissa<sup>r</sup>.

As, then, we are fully justified in believing that Homer is speaking of Thessaly, and that the Hyperia mentioned by him is the well-known fountain of Pheræ, so too it is not improbable that the Messeis was a fountain of equal value to the inhabitants of Larissa.

Now, among the coins of Pheræ, we have one bearing on its reverse, *Fons ex leonis rictu pro-manans*, and thereby shewing the great importance attached by the Pheræans to their fountain Hyperia. Again, among the coins of Larissa we have a similar one, bearing *Mulier stolata, amphoram genui impositam tenens, revertitur a fonte, qui ex leonis faucibus profluit*. It is clear, then, that Larissa possessed a valuable fountain as well as Pheræ: it has even been surmised that Larissa, after the manner of all antiquity, was proud of the notice taken of its fountain in these lines of Homer<sup>s</sup>, and intended to represent

<sup>q</sup> Lib. IX. p. 660.

<sup>r</sup> So also Lucan, (VI. 355.)

Atque olim Larissa potens, ubi nobile quondam  
Nunc super Argos arant.

<sup>s</sup> Aristotle, in his Rhet. I. 16. 3. refers to a well-known instance of the value attached, in ancient times, to the au-

on this very coin the case which was painfully imagined by Hector, of Andromache, a captive, bearing back water from Messeis. It may tend to confirm this opinion to observe, that the name and head of Homer, and even the word ΙΑΙΑΣ, may be seen on coins of Chios, and other places of the Ægean; and that the device of a Roman coin, which will be noticed hereafter, is evidently constructed on a well-known passage of the *Odyssey*.

My next instance is taken from the History of Agathocles, the tyrant of Syracuse, whilst he was waging war in Africa against the Carthaginians. Diodorus<sup>t</sup> says of him, that, finding his troops dispirited at the superior strength of the enemy, he secretly let out a number of owls among them, which, perching upon their shields and helmets, were hailed as a sure token of the favour of Minerva, and occasioned the splendid victory that followed. Now we are well aware that the casual appearance of an owl<sup>u</sup> was actually made an omen of the great victory which was won by the Athe-

thority of Homer; and the case is fully explained by Clarke in his note on *Iliad*. II. 558. A parallel may be found in a German author that I have met with, who describes the university of Wittenberg as the place where Luther preached, and where Shakspeare records that Hamlet studied.

<sup>t</sup> Diod. XX. 11.

<sup>u</sup> See Wesseling on the passage of Diodorus.

nians at Salamis; and it was in allusion to that fact that Aristophanes<sup>x</sup> says in the *Σφηκές*,

γλαυξ γὰρ ἡμῶν πρὶν μάχεσθαι τὸν στρατὸν διέπτeto.

Yet, admitting the full force of such a popular superstition, it is difficult to believe in [the contrivance imputed to Agathocles, until we find that one of his coins, which, from bearing the emblems of an elephant, must be assigned to Africa, bears also this significant device, *Pallas instar Victoriæ alata d. hastam vibrat, s. clypeum, pro pedibus noctua*.

My last instance shall be introduced by a quotation from the *Spectator*, and a reference to our own neighbourhood. “A rebus,” says the *Spectator*†, “has lately been hewn out in freestone, “and erected over two of the portals of Blenheim House, being the figure of a monstrous lion tearing to pieces a little cock. For the better understanding of which device, I must acquaint my English reader, that a cock has the misfortune “to be called in Latin by the same word that signifies a Frenchman, as a lion is the emblem of “the English nation.”

Now I will not attempt to justify the sculptor for constructing his device upon the armorial emblems of the two nations, nor yet will I quote

<sup>x</sup> Vesp. v. 1086.

<sup>y</sup> Spect. N<sup>o</sup>. 59.

Guillim in his Display of Heraldry, for the purpose of proving that the quadruped is of right the king of beasts, as the biped is the knight of birds; my only object, at present, being to shew, that, whatever degree of solemn trifling has been employed in these matters by the moderns, it had been invented long before by the ancients. The bravery of the lion has been acknowledged at all periods of history, and the gallantry of the cock has been set forth as eloquently by the ancient Plutarch<sup>z</sup> as by the modern Guillim. But they were both of them favourite emblems of ancient heraldry. We find, from the coins of Sicily, that the beast was adopted by the Leontines, from the connexion, doubtless, which he bore to their name; and that the bird was the emblem of Himera. It is not so apparent in the latter case to what good fortune it was owing that the cock obtained a place upon the ancient coins of Himera; but it is strongly suspected that the name of the town, originally the same with *ἡμέρα*, suggested the notion of the daybreak; and the daybreak as naturally gave occasion to the cock-crowing. I cannot produce a piece of ancient sculpture to denote the former triumphs of either animal, and to take away the merit of novelty from the Blenheim re-

<sup>z</sup> Plut. vol. VI. pp. 725, et 837, et 887. Vol. VIII. p. 782, &c.

bus ; but, in the absence of it, I will quote a proverb, preserved by Plutarch, which speaks of the hatred subsisting between the lion and the cock, and is much less likely to have arisen from the actual conflicts of the animals themselves, than from some similar conceit of ancient heraldry, ἐκὸς δὲ καὶ τῷ λέοντι πρὸς τὸν ἀλεκτρυόνα μῖσος ἰσχυρὸν γεγεννηκέναι τὸν φόβον<sup>a</sup>.

But I will not leave it to be supposed that this was the only method by which the people of Himera were able to provide devices for their coins. We have a brass of Himera, bearing on its reverse *Vir senilis stans, involutus pallio et scipione nixus, volumen explicatum manu tenet*. Doubtless this figure was intended to represent some distinguished citizen of theirs, or perhaps some celebrated statue erected by them to his memory. You will be reminded accordingly of those splendid works of art which were restored to Himera by Scipio, when he had taken Carthage, and were afterwards carried off by the rapacity of Verres. Among them, says Cicero<sup>b</sup>, “ erat etiam Stesichori “ poëtæ statua senilis, incurva, cum libro, summo, “ ut putant, artificio facta ; qui fuit Himæræ.”

<sup>a</sup> Plut. de Inv. et Od. vol. VIII. p. 126. See also vol. X. p. 84.

<sup>b</sup> In Verr. lib. II. c. 35.

## LECTURE IV.

A SCALE of criteria attempted by Barthelemy—Periods usually adopted—Period of excellence—Perfection of workmanship—Arrangement of Pellerin and Eckhel—Advantages of that arrangement—Medals and coins distinguished—Hardouin—Barthelemy—Medallions—Examples of them—Contorniati—Tesseræ—Countermarks on medals—Different materials of money—Iron, tin, and lead—Gold—Its purity—Electrum—Where used—Silver—Early adulterations in Greece—Later adulterations at Rome—Copper—Brass—Corinthian brass—Minting by the hammer—Practice of Greece—Practice at Rome—Ancient dies—Count Caylus—Plaster moulds—Classification of devices—Smaller emblems—Proper names of coins.



AN attempt was made by the learned Barthelemy, in some papers communicated by him to the French Academy, to establish certain general criteria, from which any given coin might be assigned, with a fair degree of probability, to its proper period of time. He hoped that by noticing in their order all the characteristics of coins, which were known from recorded facts or dates to belong to exact periods, a scale of circumstances might be arranged, agreeing sufficiently among themselves, and corresponding with the general knowledge we possess of the progress made by the ancients in literature and the arts. By means of such a scale, an ancient coin, possessing any characteristics whatsoever, might, it was hoped, be assigned to a definite time ; and if, as was probable, its inscription gave any evidence of the place where it was minted, it would then become valuable for purposes of history. The plan was well imagined, but seems to have failed entirely of success. The first paper was read in the year 1750 ; the next did not appear till upwards of thirty years afterwards ; and the most valuable, because the most difficult part of the undertaking, appears to have been abandoned by him as impracticable.

Nevertheless, there are great numbers of coins, which, partly from the words they actually bear, and partly from other distinctions, can easily be arranged within definite periods of time ; and when new coins are found corresponding with the tokens of any of those periods, and minted at the same places to which the other specimens belong, it is not unreasonable to suppose that some farther light will be thrown upon their history. It has been the practice, therefore, of numismatic writers, to arrange ancient coins under five distinct periods. 1. From the commencement of coinage to about the year 460 before Christ. 2. From that date to the reign of Philip, the son of Amyntas, comprising one hundred years. 3. From the commencement of the reign of Philip to the overthrow of the Roman republic. 4. From the overthrow of the republic to the time of Hadrian. And, 5. From Hadrian to Gallienus.

Of the two earliest of these periods, comprising the history of coins from its commencement to about the year 360 B.C., it is not my intention to treat. It will be evident, from the details already laid before you, and from the natural progress of the arts, that the specimens supposed to belong to these early periods are either too uncertain as to their origin, or too rude in their structure, to throw any light upon ancient history. It is true,

that they are valuable in the eyes of the collector, not merely because their high antiquity gives them a greater degree of rareness, but also for these better reasons, that they tend to illustrate, though but remotely, the progress of ancient art, and are themselves illustrated by the narratives of ancient authors. But these reasons cannot have much connexion with our present purpose. The progress of ancient art, if it came within our province, would require means of elucidation, at once more copious and more exact, than can be obtained from coins; and to borrow illustration from ancient authors, for the purpose of making coins intelligible, is to invert the natural uses of them both. I may add also, that any explanation connected with the peculiar forms of the letters impressed upon them, is properly left to a course of lectures on palæography, for which we have much better materials in the inscriptions that are to be obtained from ancient marbles, and are known to belong to those early periods.

But after the commencement of the reign of Philip, and during the three centuries which elapsed before the overthrow of the Roman republic, (that important interval which constitutes the third period,) we are brought fully within the golden age of ancient art. Brass, as well as the two more precious metals, was then in general use; the inscriptions then began to add the names

of individuals; and the execution was so highly wrought, that the devices of the time may be considered as approaching nearly to the truth of historical painting. There is nothing in either ancient or modern workmanship which can surpass the gold coins of Philip and his son Alexander, and many also of the coins of Sicily and Magna Græcia, which are generally attributed to the same period. But their excellence is too well known to require any farther notice from me. It is, however, worthy of observation, that this high condition of workmanship was not confined to the more distinguished states of Greece, but is to be seen in the coins of inconsiderable towns, carried too to its utmost perfection, and appearing alike on every specimen. And yet, says Eckhel<sup>a</sup>, no one can persuade himself that mere money, destined for common use, and exposed to constant injury, can, under ordinary circumstances, have had the same labour and expense bestowed upon it, as gems or statues, which were preserved with the utmost care, being treated as if they were objects of religious worship. The plain conclusion is, that the fine arts, in all departments, were too far advanced, and the public taste too highly cultivated, to admit, even in their coinage, of an exception from the universal display of highly-

<sup>a</sup> Eck. vol. I. p. 138. Prol.

finished workmanship, unless some important reason, like the one already mentioned in the case of Athens, should require it. "When we compare," says Payne Knight<sup>b</sup>, "the smallness and insignificance of many of these states, scarcely known to the historian or geographer, with the exquisite beauty, elegance, and costly refinement displayed in their money, the common drudge of retail traffic in the lowest stages of society, we must admit that there is scarcely any thing more wonderful in the history of man." There are innumerable coins of this period, which are as creditable to the makers of them as the most exquisite gems of Greece or Rome. In the latter case we are made acquainted with the names of Dioscorides, and other eminent artists; but in the former there is no coin, hitherto discovered, that bears the name of its minter, with the solitary exception of one belonging to Cydonia in Crete; there is only one ancient inscription from which we can learn the name of any individual employed in cutting dies at the Roman mint<sup>c</sup>; and even in the long list of artists preserved by the elder Pliny, there is no mention whatever of any coin-engraver.

It will, I conceive, be evident, without entering

<sup>b</sup> *Archæol.* vol. XIX. p. 369.

<sup>c</sup> See Marini, *Inscriz. Alban.* p. 109. quoted by Henning, p. 66. vol. I.

into detail, that a classification of coins, constructed solely upon their reputed ages, would be of little benefit to us, even granting that it were practicable. There are but few coins, the dates of which can be exactly ascertained; and even if there were many, we should still be subject to the inconvenience of associating specimens together, brought from the most distant countries, and bearing no relation to each other. Different methods have been adopted by different writers, distinguishing by the metal, the size, the device, or the inscription, according to the object respectively proposed by them; but the arrangement introduced by Pellerin, and improved by Eckhel, and founded on the combined relations of time and place, is now the most frequently followed. According to this arrangement, all coins are divided into two classes; the first containing those of different people, cities, and kings, (in other words, all coins not strictly Roman); the second containing those only which are of Roman coinage. Again, the first class is subdivided geographically into provinces, their ancient limits being observed, and the provinces themselves succeeding each other in their order from west to east, but the several states within them being taken alphabetically. In cases, moreover, where there have been sovereigns, their coins are placed chronologically, after the consideration of each respective

state. The second class, again, is subdivided into three parts: the first containing all consular coins, and including the most ancient form of coinage; the second, all coins bearing names of Roman families; the third, all coins of emperors, Cæsars, and their kindred; the coins of Roman families being placed, from the necessity of the case, alphabetically; those of the emperors being ranged, as far as is practicable, in chronological succession. It is plain that this classification, when considered theoretically, is clumsy and inartificial; it is plain too, that specimens, minted in remote provinces, will still be placed under the head of Roman coinage, if they happen, for instance, to bear the name of an emperor: thus the coins of the emperor Carausius will fall within the last variety, although they would seem to belong to the class of provinces, being all of them probably minted in Britain. It is also plain that such a classification is not the best suited for display, in the arrangement of a cabinet: nevertheless it is, in fact, the best which has hitherto been suggested. It accommodates itself, so far as its materials permit, to the promotion of real knowledge; it places those medals side by side, which, from their proximity in time, or place, or both, have some assignable connexion with each other; it sacrifices the uniformity of arranging all coins by their metal or size, however perfect such an arrangement

might be in technical exactness, for the real usefulness of making them throw light historically upon each other, even though the only method that can be employed in doing so, is inartificial and inaccurate.

And this is the arrangement, which, with some occasional variations, is now generally adopted. Other distinctions, however, must be noticed, founded upon physical or accidental differences, for the double purpose of explaining the technical terms belonging to this branch of study, and of introducing so much of narrative, as it may be necessary to lay before you respecting coinage in general.

You will have observed that the words "coins" and "medals" have hitherto been used indiscriminately, as if it were not intended to acknowledge that any important distinction exists between them. The distinction, in point of fact, has not been generally observed; and the neglect of it is probably owing to the impossibility of separating those specimens which were intended to be used as money, from specimens designed for other purposes. There are, indeed, some among them of so large a size, and so peculiar in other respects, that they cannot be confounded with common currency. But for these I reserve the term *medallion*, intending to use the term *medals* as denoting all minted pieces whatsoever, and



*coins* to distinguish those among them which were designed as money.

It was an opinion, however, maintained by Hardouin, and before him by Erizzo, that none of the various specimens we possess were issued as money, but were all of them originally bestowed as tokens or memorials. But the opinions of Hardouin, as Barthelemy<sup>d</sup> well observes, have no longer any claim to be refuted; and the circumstances of the case are so directly opposed to this opinion of his, that we now endeavour to ascertain what medals are tokens or memorials, by examining whether they possess the known characteristics of coins.

Those characteristics may be thus briefly stated. Wherever any class of specimens preserves the same specific character, though minted in different years, or even reigns, or even, as in some cases, in different centuries; wherever they present a uniformity of weight, or device, or general style of workmanship, allowing only for the changes required by the varying condition of the arts; wherever they have been found in immense numbers; wherever they bear in their inscription either the name or the denoted value of a coin; in those cases we may infer that they were issued as common money. We have, for instance, a series

<sup>d</sup> B. L. vol. XXXII. p. 672.

of gold and silver coins of Philip and Alexander, preserving a strict correspondence with each other, and being specimens, doubtless, of the money so often mentioned by ancient authors under the names of those illustrious sovereigns. We have also a long series of Athenian tetradrachms, varying somewhat, as we might naturally expect, in their actual weight, but maintaining a constant resemblance to each other, and extending apparently from the earliest times down to the Christian era.

On the contrary, when medals are of much greater bulk than the common coins of the same country; when they are few in number, and yet varying among themselves; when, in addition to these circumstances, they are highly finished in their workmanship; we cannot reasonably consider them as money, and must include them in the class of medallions. We have examples in each of the three metals. Some of the gold pieces of Lysimachus, king of Thrace, weigh as much as four, or six, or even ten, of our sovereigns; though I must not omit to notice, that Mionnet<sup>e</sup> considers the larger specimens to be forgeries; and from the time of Hadrian, if not at earlier periods of the empire, we meet with large brasses, which, for many conspiring reasons, must also be treated

<sup>e</sup> Vol. I. p. 438, note.

as medallions. It is remarkable that they do not bear the letters S·C, which I have already mentioned as appearing on the brass money of the empire; and we may infer from that circumstance that they were not issued by the senate, and therefore could not form a part of the common currency. We find also large medals of Antinous<sup>f</sup> minted in different cities of Greece, and remarkable for their flattering inscriptions; though it does not appear that any medals of Antinous were minted at Rome, or that those cities themselves ever minted any other medals of similar description. In the same class may also be included medals bearing the word ἀνέθηκεν, and intended as votive offerings, together with any others designed for honorary purposes, such as those large and beautiful silver pieces of Syracuse<sup>g</sup>, which have the word ἄλλα, accompanied by military trophies, and appear to have been intended as rewards for public services.

But the most peculiar class of medallions is of brass, and known by the modern name *contorniti*, which was given to them, probably, from the hollow circle impressed upon the face of them. These medallions are generally of little thickness,

<sup>f</sup> Eck. vol. VI. p. 530.

<sup>g</sup> Payne Knight supposes these, as well as all other medals of ancient states, whether republican or monarchical, to have been issued as money.—Archæol. vol. XIX. p. 369.

of very low relief in their devices, presenting on the one side the figure of some illustrious character of Greece or Rome, and on the other some subject connected with their mythology or public festivals. Taken in all their circumstances, they are totally different from the common medals of antiquity, and bear so strong a correspondence among themselves, that they cannot reasonably be assigned to distinct periods. Many different opinions, none of them, however, being very satisfactory, have been formed respecting the time and purpose of their fabrication; but the most probable opinion is, that they were minted at Constantinople between the times of Constantine and Valentinian<sup>h</sup>, and were used as tesserae in public exhibitions.

Nevertheless, besides those which, from their size and singularity, may fairly be considered as medallions, there are doubtless many others approaching much more nearly to the character of coins, which yet were not issued originally as money. I need not enter into particulars respecting the many purposes for which tesserae were wanted at the public festivals of Greece and Rome, or the various methods by which the Romans of the empire amused themselves in sending tokens of remembrance to their friends, and re-

<sup>h</sup> Eck. vol. VIII. p. 311.

quiring similar tokens in return ; but it is worthy of notice, that, from the ostentatious period of Hadrian and the Antonines, we find the devices of their medals much more commonly borrowed from ceremonies and public spectacles, indicating thereby the purposes for which they were probably employed. As they are discovered, however, in immense numbers, and would seem on that account to belong to the description of coins, I will quote a passage from Suetonius, which describes a largess of the emperor Nero, and shews that *tesseræ* would sometimes be required in enormous quantities. “*Sparsa et populo missilia omnium rerum per omnes dies ; singula quotidie millia avium cujusque generis, multiplex penus, tesseræ frumentariæ, vestis, aurum, argentum, gemmæ, margaritæ, tabulæ pictæ, mancipia, jumenta atque etiam mansuetæ feræ ; novissime naves, insulæ, agri*<sup>i</sup>.”

It is the opinion of some persons that these *tesseræ*, though not originally so intended, were afterwards used as money ; and the countermarks, which are in many instances found upon ancient coins, both silver and brass, are supposed to be the public stamps, by which they were acknowledged as a legal tender.

I have now to describe the different materials of which ancient coins are composed.

<sup>i</sup> Suet. Nero. p. 97. See also Xiphil. LXI. 18.

We are informed, on such authority as that of Suidas<sup>k</sup>, that money of leather and of shells was once used by the Romans; and by Cedrenus, that wood was also employed by them for the same purpose. Aristides<sup>l</sup> says, that leather money was once current at Carthage; and Seneca<sup>m</sup> makes the same remark of Sparta. But with respect to all these cases alike we may answer, that no such money is now known to exist; that the authorities quoted are in no instance competent evidence respecting times so far remote from them; and that if such money ever had existed, and could have been preserved to the present day, it would be as utterly destitute of historical usefulness to us, as of intrinsic value in itself. We are told, on authority somewhat more considerable, that iron was used in the same manner at Sparta, at Clazomenæ, at Byzantium, and at Rome; and tin also, by Dionysius of Syracuse. No ancient specimen in either of these metals has ever been discovered; but we may admit that such coins have actually existed, and may account for their total disappearance by the extreme remoteness of the time when they were made, and the great probability that they would long since have been decomposed. Lead has also been mentioned by ancient authors as formerly used in coinage; and Ficoroni has pub-

<sup>k</sup> In Ἀσσία.

<sup>l</sup> Orat. II. Platon.

<sup>m</sup> De Benef. lib. V. c. 14.

lished a dissertation on the subject, which he illustrates from a collection made by himself, containing upwards of a thousand specimens in this metal, some of which purport to have been minted as early as the times of the Antonines, but the greater number are of much more recent periods. Some of these specimens may fairly be considered as weights, others as tesseræ, and even the few which seem entitled to be ranked as coins, may be left without farther notice. We come then to the three important metals, gold, silver, and copper, with their several varieties.

The gold employed by the ancients for their coin, if not obtained at first in a sufficiently pure state, was improved, as far as their means would admit of it, by grinding and roasting. They were not able to separate the baser admixture by any chemical process, but they could expel it by the action of fire, leaving the gold itself uninjured<sup>n</sup>. It is in this way that we understand the words χρυσίου ἀπέφθον used by Thucydides<sup>o</sup>, which the

<sup>n</sup> See Diod. Sic. l. III. c. 14. for an account of the method of smelting adopted in Ethiopia. For a general history of Grecian mining, see Jacob on Prec. Met. vol. I. p. 67; and for an account of the mines in Attica, see Boeckh. Staats-haushaltung der Athener. book III; or his Dissertation on the Silver Mines of Laurion, in the Memoirs of the Berlin Academy for the years 1814 and 1815.

<sup>o</sup> Thuc. II. 13.

scholiast interprets *πλλάκις ἐψηθέντος, ὥστε γενέσθαι ὀβρυζον*, and the word *obrussam* occurs in Pliny and Suetonius, denoting gold so purified. But simple as the operation was, it seems to have been completely successful. The Darics of Persia appear to have contained only one  $\frac{1}{24}$  part of alloy; the gold coins of Philip and Alexander reach a much higher degree of fineness; and from some experiments made at Paris on a gold coin of Vespasian, it appears that in that instance the alloy was only in the ratio of one to 788. In our own gold coin the alloy consists of one part in twelve.

Some alloy (but a very small quantity is sufficient for the purpose) is desirable to make the gold hard and durable for common use. The alloys generally used are copper and silver; and when the latter is mixed with the gold in any considerable quantity, it then forms the compound known in ancient times by the term *electrum*, and so called, probably, from its resemblance to pale amber. According to Pliny<sup>p</sup> the proportions were four parts of gold to one of silver; but other writers mention a greater quantity of the less precious metal, and the specimens that have been actually examined, vary from the standard recorded by Pliny, down to a much lower degree of purity<sup>q</sup>.

It is stated by Lampridius, in his life of Alex-

<sup>p</sup> Lib. XXXIII. c. 23.

<sup>q</sup> Henin, vol. I. p. 122.



ander Severus <sup>r</sup>, that coins of electrum were minted by that emperor; but no such coins have hitherto been discovered, and Lampridius is a writer of so little authority, that the evidence thus afforded against him, although it merely amounts to a want of testimony in his favour, is thought by many persons a sufficient proof that his statement is inaccurate. So true is it that we often reject a reputed fact, and are incautiously led to assume the opposite opinion, not because we have some positive testimony on our side, but because the writer who records the fact has become for some other reason an object of suspicion to us. But however this may be in the present instance, there are coins of this metal still in existence, minted, in some instances, by kings of the Cimmerian Bosphorus, and in others attributed to different towns of Sicily. I have mentioned these cases rather than some others which might have been noticed, because they may enable us to decide on the much disputed question, whether this kind of coinage was adopted by the ancients, because they wished to lower the standard, or because they were actually unable to separate the gold from the less precious metal. It may readily be granted that the metal used by barbarian princes was minted in the condition in which it was actually found, but it is plainly shewn by the

<sup>r</sup> Eck. vol. V. p. 24. Prol.

gold coins still existing, that no civilized state could have laboured under any difficulty in obtaining metal sufficiently pure.

It appears, on an examination of silver coins, that this metal was preserved in a high degree of purity throughout the early and the middle periods of ancient coinage. Demosthenes<sup>s</sup> indeed has recorded, in his speech against Timocrates, that Solon accused many states of his time of adulterating their silver coin by the admixture of copper or lead. But as the orator was not debating the history of coinage, and used these reputed words of Solon only in the way of illustration, as, moreover, no silver coin of those early times has yet been examined, which does not reach a high degree of purity, we may be at liberty to wait till we meet with more direct testimony on the subject. Perhaps, however, the best solution is the following; that though the orator uses the words ἀργυρίῳ πρὸς χαλκὸν καὶ μόλιβδον κεκραμένῳ, and would therefore seem to be speaking of adulterated metal, he is in fact referring to those plated coins, which are believed to have been minted not only in his own times, but also as early as the days of Solon, and which are the counterfeits so often referred to in the metaphors of ancient poets. In later periods, and more especially

<sup>s</sup> P. 855. ed. Clarend. p. 765. ed. Reiske.

from the time of Caracalla, the standard of silver underwent different degrees of degradation, till in some instances the copper united with it amounted to the proportion of 4 to 1<sup>t</sup>. Adulteration could not well be carried farther, and in the basest periods of the empire, between the times of Gallienus and Diocletian, recourse was had to the ancient fraud of plating, and what was hitherto held to be the work of felons, was permanently adopted and legalized by the successors of the Cæsars.

The brasses of the ancients contain for the most part a quantity of tin united with the native copper. As the mines which are known to have been worked by them, do not appear to have given them these two metals in combination, we may infer that tin was made use of designedly, and from their knowing the unfitness of mere copper for the purposes of money. The advantage, however, of the combination is shewn more clearly in its reference to numismatic studies. Disinter some Roman brasses, containing but little admixture of other metal with their native copper, and you have to mourn over a work of destruction, like the havoc made by some confluent disease upon a beautiful countenance; but if the alloy have been properly united with it, the speci-

<sup>t</sup> These varieties are known, in numismatic writers, though not very distinctly, by the French words *potin* and *billon*.

men has become much more attractive during its concealment by that soft shadowing of green and brown, which has spread itself over it, *οἷον τοῖς ἀκμαίοις ἡ ὥρα*<sup>u</sup>, and which, more than any other property, baffles the ingenuity of modern forgers.

Of Corinthian brass I need not say any thing; because, whatever the compound was, it is not believed to have been ever used for coinage. It is stated by Pliny<sup>x</sup>, and repeated at greater length by Florus<sup>y</sup>, and by others after him, that this compound was owing to the accidental mixture of gold and silver and copper in a state of fusion at the burning of Corinth: but even Pliny himself has noticed the employment of this metal for works of art at a much earlier period than the time of that conflagration; and we may perhaps assign the reputation it possessed at any period, as much to the skill of Corinthian workmanship, as to the peculiar excellence of the compound. It was on a principle somewhat similar, that when Antipho was asked by the tyrant Dionysius, what was the best kind of brass, he answered, That which composes the statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton<sup>z</sup>.

I have already intimated that the medals of the ancients were produced by the hammer, rather

<sup>u</sup> Eth. Nic. X. 4. 8.

<sup>x</sup> Lib. XXXIV. c. 3.

<sup>y</sup> Lib. II. c. 16.

<sup>z</sup> Plut. De Adul. vol. VI. p. 249. Reiske.

than by melting. It appears, indeed, that the flan, or piece of unstamped metal, was commonly prepared for the die by melting, but afterwards the impression was given to it by the hammer. It is not known why this more laborious process was adopted by them, though it may fairly be presumed that the higher degree of finish which may thereby be given to medals, would be a sufficient reason for retaining it at the more advanced periods of their history, and for cases which required a better style of execution. It may also be a matter of surprise, that, with their imperfect command over metals, they should still have recourse to the hammer for common purposes; as they would be compelled, from want of a well-tempered material, to be constantly making new dies, after a small number of impressions had been taken. But this difficulty only furnishes us with a new evidence in favour of what has been stated as to the general practice. It is a singular fact, that in very few instances<sup>a</sup> have any two ancient coins been found which evidently proceeded from the same die. The prince Torre-Muzza, for instance, who was for many years a collector of Sicilian medals<sup>b</sup>, could not find in his extensive cabinet

<sup>a</sup> One instance, and that a peculiar one, is noticed by Payne Knight as a "rare occurrence, even in pieces the most common." *Archæol.* vol. XIX. p. 375.

<sup>b</sup> This collection was purchased by lord Northwick.

any two that corresponded in all particulars with each other.

Such then was the practice of Greece, until that country sunk in the universal degeneracy of Europe; and such also was the practice of Rome, with the exception of the earliest period, when brass alone was current, and the times that followed the reign of Septimius Severus, when the fine arts and the public honour were equally degraded. Other exceptions indeed in favour of melting appear occasionally to have occurred; but after the times of Severus it seems to have become the established practice of Rome, having already been adopted in the distant provinces of the empire.

Many ancient dies of different periods have actually been found, and are still preserved: but I shall confine myself to two, belonging to the time of Augustus, which were discovered among the ruins of Nismes. One of them, soon after it was found, was placed under the machine, then used for minting, in order to obtain an impression from it; but was broken into pieces by the force of the impact. The other came into the possession of the count Caylus<sup>c</sup>, and is stated by him to have consisted of copper, zinc, tin, and lead in equal quantities. This then was the metal supposed, in the time of Augustus, to possess the greatest de-

<sup>c</sup> Rec. d'Antiq. vol. I. p. 285.

gree of hardness. In after-times a kind of steel was used for the same purpose, and dies of that metal are still in existence.

But the most remarkable discovery in this branch of the subject is of plaster moulds, intended evidently for casting coins. A mould of this description, purporting to be of the times of Severus, was found at Lyons, and is minutely described by the same count Caylus, in his work on antiquities<sup>d</sup>. By him these moulds are supposed to have been used at the public mints; but Mahudel<sup>e</sup> has maintained, in the Memoirs of the French Academy, and Eckhel has since confirmed the opinion, that they were the contrivances employed by ancient forgers. We admit, indeed, that melting must have been part of that occupation of the public moneyers, which was commonly described by the words *auro argento æri flando feriundo*; but it seems probable that, at the best periods of the Roman coinage, the melting was confined to the preparing of the plate of metal for the reception of the die. The rest of the operation was the business of the hammer, and is fitly denoted by a silver coin of the republic, bearing on the face of it the head of a female, with the inscription *Moneta*, and on the reverse, the pincers, the hammer, the anvil, and the cap of Vulcan.

<sup>d</sup> Rec. d'Ant. vol. I. p. 286.

<sup>e</sup> Tom. III. p. 221.

The classification of ancient devices is an undertaking of the greatest interest, but much too intricate and extensive for a course of public lectures. Call to your recollection, however, all the ingenuity, real and fictitious, that has been exerted in contriving emblems for modern heraldry, and you will only have a duplicate of the skill employed upon the devices of ancient coins. Some of them commemorated early legends, others the worship of a guardian deity; some the real sources of public wealth, others the natural objects in the neighbourhood; some the encouragement given to the arts, others the services of illustrious men; Cyrene adopted the silphium, which it cultivated for foreign commerce; Selinus, the sprig of parsley, corresponding with its name; Sicily was distinguished by the Triquetra, or three legs united; and Rhodes obtained from the word *ῥόδον* its favourite bearing of a rose<sup>f</sup>.

But besides these general devices, there frequently appear on coins smaller emblems of infinite variety, which are supposed by some to de-

<sup>f</sup> This seems to have been the opinion of ancient commentators; as it clearly was of Eustathius; (see his note on the *Odys.* lib. V. p. 1527. l. 58.) but Spanheim and others maintain that the flower represented on the coins of Rhodes is that of the pomegranate, which was used in dying, and became in consequence an article of commerce. *Spanh.* vol. I. p. 317, &c.



note the different minting-places, and by others the sigla of the different moneyers. That one or other was the object of them appears to be confirmed by the fact that they are not to be found on any of the medals of the emperors, believed to have been minted at Rome.

I need scarcely add, that, besides those common appellations obtained from the persons or the places that minted them, such as Darics and Cyzicenes, there are other names of coins, occurring in classical authors, which were derived entirely from their devices. Such names are the γλαῦξ and the κόρα of Athens, the πῶλος or Pegasus of Corinth, the τοξότης of Persia, and the Bigati or Victoriati of Rome, derived from their car, or their figure of Victory.



## LECTURE V.

GRECIAN coinage—Fabulous history of it—Phido the Argive—Alexander the First of Macedon—Athenian coins—Money of account—Athenian gold—Dispute respecting it—Aristophanes—Thucydides—Lysias—Demosthenes—Æschines—Athenian inscriptions—Darics, Cyzicenes—Athenian silver—Its purity—Tetradrachma—Didrachma, &c.—Their legends and devices—The owl of Athens—The diota—Coin of the time of Mithridates—Athenian brass—Wood and Dionysius—Dean Swift and Aristophanes—Salmasius—Recal of base money—Brass coins very numerous—Two specimens of them—Coins of Sparta—Two specimens of them—Coins of Bœotia—Orchomenus—Thebes—Passage of Xenophon amended—Coins of Elis—Mistaken for the Falisci—Explained by Payne Knight.

I CANNOT better introduce the subject of Grecian coinage, than by quoting some eloquent observations of Eckhel<sup>a</sup>, well deserving of the theme on which he wrote them. After noticing the universal prevalence of good taste and delicate execution, not merely in the coinage of other states, but even in the less favoured regions of Bœotia and Arcadia, he adds; “Quod vero mirandum est  
“ maxime, quum coloni Græcia profecti in medio  
“ gentium barbararum maximeque dissitarum sedes sibi quærerent, tantum abfuit ut patriæ suæ  
“ artes pulcrique amorem dedicerent, ut vicinos  
“ barbaros magis ad artium præcepta instituerent  
“ quam ab his corrumperentur. Tam altas in  
“ animo mirabilis hujus populi radices fixit artium ac philosophiæ amor, ut, quod patria Græcia dictavit, quocunque sub cœlo repræsentaret,  
“ neque antea a veteribus institutis degeneraret,  
“ quam ipsa mater, a qua etsi longe disjunctus  
“ alimenta semper petivit, avitum cultum atque  
“ instituta sensim abjiceret.” So that the total decay of literature and the arts in the colonies of Greece, which followed on the debasement of Greece itself, may be likened to that reputed sympathy of plants, by which the grafted progeny,

<sup>a</sup> Vol. I. p. 138. Prol.

however distant they may be from the parent stem, decay and perish as it perishes.

On the fabulous part of history I shall not, either in this instance or in any other, waste your time by saying a single word. Whoever may feel a curiosity of this nature may trace the history of coinage through the times of the Patriarchs to the days of Tubalcain, by consulting the works of Rinck<sup>b</sup> and other authors. I shall content myself with referring to an early notice in the Arundelian marbles, which is the more entitled to consideration, because it is thought by several writers to have been confirmed in its statement by an ancient coin. The words of the marble appear to be *Φείδων ὁ Ἀργεῖος νόμισμα ἀργυρεῦν ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ἐποίησεν*, and the date given to the fact corresponds with the year 894 B. C. Ægina, moreover, is known to have coined money at an early period, the denominations of which have also been noticed in the works of classical authors; and this Phido<sup>c</sup> the Argive seems to have been considered by the ancients as the inventor of weights and measures, and the first stamper of Grecian coins. Now there is a coin in the Brandenburg collection, described by Beger, which bears on the one side a diota, with the inscription ΦΙΔΟ; and on the other a Boeotian shield. The objection urged by

<sup>b</sup> Vet. Num. Pot. p. 9.

<sup>c</sup> See Herod. VI. 127. Strabo, VIII.

Barthelemy<sup>d</sup>, that the word ΦΙΔΟ is written in the marble with a diphthong, and that the E is wanting in the coin, is of no weight whatever; but it may certainly be maintained, that the known device of Ægina is, almost without an exception, a tortoise, and that the shield portrayed upon the coin is as exclusively a badge of Bœotia, and is too highly executed for so remote a period. It appears also that it was the common practice in Bœotia to inscribe the name of some magistrate upon their coins. Upon the whole therefore we must assign the present specimen, not to Ægina, but to Bœotia, a district much less celebrated for its cultivation of the arts.

The oldest Grecian coins now extant, and capable of being assigned, without much hesitation, to their proper date, are the silver medals of Alexander the First of Macedon, minted about the year of the battle of Marathon. But though the coins of this country are preeminent in any well-stored cabinet, and its history excites a peculiar interest whenever it interposes itself in the affairs of Greece, I am prevented from examining it in detail, from the total want of records connected with it. It would not indeed be difficult to collect conjectures, or even to invent them, which might be confirmed, more or less remotely, by the

<sup>d</sup> B. L. tom. XXVI. p. 543.

devices of existing coins ; but such conjectures would for the most part have little of history to support them, and the devices themselves are so simple in their nature, that they could not furnish us with any specific information. We pass on therefore to consider the most interesting of all ancient money, the coins of Athens.

It is well known that the mina and the talent, which we meet with so commonly in Athenian calculations, were not coins, but merely money of account ; and the different names of coins, which actually circulated, I mean the drachms and obols, with their multiples and parts, are so familiar to you, that I will treat the subject, not in reference to those distinctions, but under the three general heads of gold, silver, and brass.

Winkelman<sup>e</sup> says, that he saw in the Farnese collection at Naples a gold coin of Athens, of singular beauty, which he calls a quinarius, but does not describe more precisely. Mionnet however, in his excellent catalogue of coins, takes no notice of it, and Eckhel<sup>f</sup> is persuaded that in this, as in many other instances, his brother antiquary was mistaken. But there is another specimen, which was presented by King George the Third to the well-known William Hunter, and was bequeathed by him to the college of Glasgow. It weighs

<sup>e</sup> Storia delle Arti, tom. II. p. 184.

<sup>f</sup> Vol. II. p. 206.



132 $\frac{3}{4}$  English grains, and is described in Combe's catalogue as bearing on the obverse, *Caput Minervæ galeatum ad d.*; on the reverse, *Noctua stans ad d. pone, olivæ ramus et luna crescens; ante, quiddam ignotum*; with the inscription AΘE. The *quiddam ignotum* is a cylindrical figure, similar to what is known in a moulding by the term *billet*. Now this is the only gold coin of Athens actually producible<sup>g</sup>; and it is on that account an object of great interest, and still greater suspicion. Let us see what information can be obtained from ancient authors. The passage which

<sup>g</sup> Walpole says, (Collections, vol. I. p. 445, note,) that there is a genuine Attic stater in lord Elgin's possession; but I have not been able to obtain any further information respecting it. Sestini also, in his Dissertation "Degli Statèri Antichi," p. 109, after mentioning the stater of the Hunterian collection, says, "Altri n' esistono nel Tesoro Britannico ed in Musei privati," &c. But here Sestini is strangely inaccurate. Combe's Catalogue of the Medals in the British Museum does not notice any Attic stater; and the Catalogue itself, although it had been published three years previously, does not appear at that time to have been ever consulted by Sestini. It is true that some Athenian colonies, as for instance Phocæa, had gold coins; and Sestini considers this fact as a proof of the existence of the same kind of coins at an earlier period in the mother country. The argument scarcely deserves to be refuted. It would be as reasonable to maintain, that the English were accustomed to calculate in dollars, because it is now the practice to do so in the United States of America.

bears most directly on the subject, and has been quoted, but with very different interpretations, by different writers, is from the *Βάτραχοι* of Aristophanes <sup>h</sup>:

πολλάκις γ' ἡμῖν ἔδοξεν ἡ πόλις πεπονθέναι  
 ταυτὸν ἔς τε τῶν πολιτῶν τοὺς καλοὺς τε καὶ καλοὺς  
 ἔς τε τὰρχαῖον νόμισμα καὶ τὸ καινὸν χρυσίον.

The whole course of the comparison shews that the poet is commending the ancient coinage as pure, and universally approved; but condemns the recently minted coins, as departing from the original standard. In the words *τὰρχαῖον νόμισμα*, therefore, he refers to their ancient silver coins, which had long been celebrated for their fineness; and the *καινὸν χρυσίον* must denote some baser issue sent recently into circulation. The difficulty is, that the word *χρυσίον* should have been used, rather than any other word connected with coinage, to denote this baser issue; and it is so strong a difficulty, as to induce Corsini<sup>i</sup> and others to suppose that gold coins were actually minted at this period, and were the degraded issue that Aristophanes complains of. But the supposition will not bear a moment's consideration. The poet could not have used such language to complain of the introduction of a more costly metal; and the

<sup>h</sup> Ver. 731.

<sup>i</sup> F. A. vol. II. p. 224. See also Boeckh, *Staatshaushaltung*, b. I. and Walpole, vol. I. p. 444.

statesmen of the time (it was, as you know, the last year but one of the Peloponnesian war) were totally unable to supply gold for such a purpose, when their resources were utterly exhausted, their last sacred deposit of a thousand talents had been expended<sup>k</sup>, and even their silver mines were no longer in their possession<sup>l</sup>. I need not dwell on the mistake of the Scholiast, who speaks of gold as actually issued at this time, and says, in another place<sup>m</sup>, that the Athenians obtained their gold from the mines of Laurium; as we well know that they were mines of silver, and were moreover at that time in the possession of the Lacedæmonians. But Aristophanes himself may put an end to the dispute; for he continues to speak of the same baser issue, and, instead of the word χρυσίον, he afterwards describes it by the more appropriate title:

*τούτοις τοῖς πονηροῖς χαλκίοις  
χθές τε καὶ πρόην κοπέισι τῷ κακίστῳ κόμματι.*

The only question then remaining is not, whether gold was issued at this period, but what reason the poet could have had for using the word χρυσίον, when he was speaking of a coinage consisting principally of copper; and that question may be answered by supposing either that he was speaking in derision, on account of the yellow colour

<sup>k</sup> Thuc. VIII. 15.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. VI. 91.

<sup>m</sup> Aristoph. Equit. v. 1091.

conveyed by the baser metal; or that χρυσίον had become, from their familiar acquaintance with the gold coins of Persia and other countries, a common term for money <sup>n</sup>.

That the Athenians had not minted any gold coin at the commencement of the Peloponnesian war is evident from the account given by Pericles<sup>o</sup> of the state of their finances; in which he mentions 6000 talents of minted silver, and bullion in both metals, but makes no mention whatever of minted gold. It is also evident that Athenian gold was not current in the time of Lysias; for in mentioning the money which was carried off by Piso<sup>p</sup>, he describes the silver generally as τρία τάλαντα, but specifies the gold as so many separate pieces of money, and all of them foreign coin, τετρακοσίους κυζικηνοὺς, καὶ ἑκατὸν δαρεικοὺς. But it is of more importance to ascertain, if possible, what was the case in the time of Demosthenes and Æschines. Now the former of them appears always to use the word ἀργύριον to signify money, whenever the passage can have any reference to

<sup>n</sup> To shew how easily a word may move on from its natural acceptation, till at last it is united with its own opposite, I will mention the word ἀργυρίς, which originally signified a cup of silver; afterwards a cup of peculiar shape, without reference to its material; and lastly, is combined, as in a fragment of Anaxilaus, with the word χρυσός: “Πίνειν ἐξ ἀργυρίδων χρυσῶν.” (Athen. lib. II. c. 26.)

<sup>o</sup> Thuc. II. 13.

<sup>p</sup> Cont. Erat. p. 391.

the number of pieces, or to the material of the coin; and never employs the word χρυσίον, except with reference to ornaments or household plate. Æschines<sup>q</sup> too, though he does use the word χρυσίον as money, always shews, either by uniting with it the epithet βασιλικόν, or by some other method, that he is speaking in those instances of foreign coin. It is also clear from an ancient inscription<sup>r</sup>, that gold was received, as well as silver, at the Athenian treasury; but we may infer from a passage of Demosthenes<sup>s</sup>, that there was a fixed rate at which Cyzicenes were allowed to circulate in Athens; we know that the value of Darics was ascertained in Athenian money<sup>t</sup>; and the two staters which are mentioned in another inscription<sup>u</sup>, as among the offerings of the Acropolis, are expressly called Phocaic, and not Athenian. There is, in short, no method of accounting for the total silence of classical antiquity respecting Athenian gold coins, and the constant mention of Darics, Cyzicenes, and other foreign staters, if gold were actually minted at Athens during that period<sup>x</sup>.

<sup>q</sup> Æsch. c. Ctes. 78. 19. et 83. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Rose, Inscrp. Gr. p. 117.

<sup>s</sup> In Phorm. p. 914.

<sup>t</sup> Thuc. VIII. 29, &c.

<sup>u</sup> Boeckh. Ins. vol. I. p. 236.

<sup>x</sup> This opinion is remarkably confirmed from two passages of Aristophanes. In the *Ἰππῆς*, (v. 472.) the poet says,

οὔτ' ἀργύριον οὔτε χρυσίον

διδούς :

and

But the metal of the greatest importance to Athens was silver. It had been employed by them for their coinage from the earliest periods of their history; it was obtained in considerable quantity from their own neighbourhood; and it formed an important item in their national revenue. The high commendation given to this coinage by Aristophanes, in the passage already noticed, was in reference, not to the delicacy of the workmanship, but to the extreme purity of the metal; and the same cause, according to the explanation formerly given by me<sup>y</sup>, seems to have deterred the Athenians from excelling in the execution of their coins, which induced them to preserve the greatest purity in the standard. The specimens accordingly of Athenian silver are very numerous, and, though evidently minted at periods very different from each other, retain so great a degree of correspondence, as implies either much political wisdom on the part of Athens, or at least a willing acquiescence in the authority of public opinion. They range from a date probably

and we may thence infer, that gold coins were current at Athens. But in the Ἐκκλησιᾷ. (v. 601.) he says,

ἀργύριον δὲ

καὶ δαρεικούς :

from which we learn, that the gold coins in common circulation were Persian Darics.

<sup>y</sup> See Lecture I.

coeval with the Persian war down to the latest times of ancient history, and consist principally of tetradrachmas, varying from  $265\frac{3}{4}$  grains in weight to 255, but descending in some few instances as low as 250 grains. The single cabinet of William Hunter contained more than one hundred specimens of this coin. The next is the didrachma of 130 grains, a coin of which there is only one specimen in the same valuable collection. The drachma of about 65 grains is followed by the tetrobolus of 44, the triobolus of 33, the diobolus of 22, the obolus of 11, and the several parts of the obolus, till you reach the quarter obolus, weighing  $2\frac{3}{4}$  grains; and express your surprise, not merely that so small a coin should ever have been minted, but still more, that it should be extant at the present day.

M. Cousinery<sup>z</sup> has assigned a considerable number of silver coins to Athens, which, if properly so assigned, must belong to a very early period of its coinage. The workmanship is rude; the reverse possesses, in several instances, the squares or crosses of the most simple style of minting; there is no inscription whatever; and the device is, not the customary owl or head of Pallas, but commonly a horse or a mask. In short, the only reason for assigning these coins to Athens is, that

<sup>z</sup> See Mionnet, vol. II. p. 112.

they were found upon the spot, and in the company of others, which are certainly of Athenian origin; but this reason, though of some importance in itself, is overborne in the present instance by the total want of correspondence in the other circumstances of the coins.

I may observe, that in none of these specimens, nor yet in any known coin of Athens hitherto discovered, is there that impress of a bull, which is said by Plutarch<sup>a</sup> to have been the device adopted by the Athenians as early as the days of Theseus, and is commonly supposed to have given occasion to the proverb *βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ*.

The silver coins of Athens are distinguished, not merely by the inscription AΘE, but by the devices of the head of Pallas and the owl, retained apparently at all periods, and under all circumstances. It is from the growing accompaniments of these devices that the respective dates of Athenian medals are attempted to be ascertained. At the earliest period, which we assume to be before the time of Pericles, the helmet on the head of Pallas is of the simplest form; in the next period it is decorated by a sphinx and two griffins, which were copied probably from the well-known statue in the Acropolis, so described by Pausanias<sup>b</sup>. And this decoration seems to have continued, va-

<sup>a</sup> Plut. in Thes. c. 25.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. I. c. 24.



rying only in its degree of finish, or the increase of its smaller ornaments, from the days of Pericles down to the latest times. In the same manner, in the first instances, the owl is accompanied only by an olive branch and a small crescent; but in process of time we have her surrounded by a wreath of laurel, standing upon a diota, accompanied by strange emblems of all times and countries, and crowded by the names of public officers. It is amusing to trace the progress of that universal citizenship which the owl of Athens at once imparted and obtained. We find her associating with herself on the coins of Athens the various devices of countries, near and distant, to which she was carried by the spread of Athenian commerce; we find, for instance, among many others less intelligible, the corn-ear of Sicily, the elephant of Africa, the Pegasus of Corinth, the sphinx of Egypt, the lion of Leontium, and the flower of Rhodes. In like manner the owl or the head of Pallas was received upon the coins of other nations, travelling through many states of Asia as well as Europe, and in many instances supplanting the ancient emblem; till it obtained a permanent establishment at the Roman mint, and at last was admitted upon the coins of Sparta. And so the genius of Athens, now conquered and degraded, had not only left traces of her fame on the national habits of her modern conquerors, but

also had been adopted and exalted by her ancient and most inveterate enemy.

The reasons for introducing these two devices originally may be found in any writer on Athenian antiquities, or may be conjectured without having recourse to their assistance; but the case of the diota, which is commonly placed horizontally under the feet of the owl, requires a separate explanation. Corsini<sup>c</sup> says, in a dissertation of his *Fasti Attici*, that it is supposed by some to refer to the amphora of oil, which was presented to the conquerors at the Panathenæa; but is himself of opinion, that it was intended to denote the manufacture of vessels in terra cotta, for which the Athenians were celebrated. We certainly know that they prided themselves on this manufacture; and we have a fragment preserved by Athenæus<sup>d</sup>, in which the poet Critias appears to think them as much deserving of fame for the invention of the potter's-wheel, as for the trophy they erected on the plain of Marathon. But I am inclined to think with Eckhel, that, as the diota was placed on the coins of Thasos, Chios, and Coreyra, in reference to the wines exported from those islands; so too the diota of Athens was an emblem of her olive grounds, and the rich products they provided for her foreign trade.

<sup>c</sup> Vol. II. p. 236.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. I. c. 50.

The only silver coin, which I intend to notice more particularly, is of the year 88 B.C., and retains, even at so late a period, the two ancient devices. It belongs to the Hunterian collection, and bears on the obverse *Caput Palladis*; on the other side, ΑΘΕ ΒΑΣΙΛΕ ΜΙΘΡΑΔΑΤΗΣ; and underneath, ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝ *Noctua diotæ insistens, in area astra solis et lunæ*. Now we learn from Athenæus<sup>e</sup> that Aristio was originally a sophist, with a different name; but that when the power of Mithridates had prevailed against the Roman influence in Athens, he ingratiated himself with the Cappadocian, and was placed at the head of the government as his representative. Such also is the information to be collected from the coin: and Aristio was in some haste to leave behind him such memorials of himself; for it also appears that Athens was taken by Sylla<sup>f</sup>, and Aristio was deposed and put to death, within a year from the time of his elevation.

I come now to the consideration of Athenian brass. In the reign of George I. a person of the name of Wood obtained a patent, empowering him to prepare a large coinage of copper for the use of Ireland. Dean Swift attacked him in his celebrated Draper's Letters, and having completely

<sup>e</sup> Lib. V. c. 48.

<sup>f</sup> Plut. in Syll. c. 14. Vol. III. p. 105. Reiske.

defeated the scheme, wrote a farther pamphlet, styling his opponent “esquire and hardware-man,” and representing him as going “in solemn procession to the gallows.” The title of Hardware-man continued with him for his life. Now the whole of this transaction had been exhibited 2000 years before at Athens. In the age of Aristides and Themistocles, a person of the name of Dionysius strongly urged the Athenians to issue brass money on account of the distresses of the times. His project was defeated, and some one of the wits of the day gave Dionysius the epithet of *ὁ χαλκοῦς*, by which he has ever since been distinguished. You will remember that Aristotle<sup>g</sup> speaks of him in his Rhetoric as an indifferent poet, and calls him *ὁ χαλκοῦς*: Plutarch enables us to assign him to his proper period of history, and still calls him *ὁ χαλκοῦς*: Athenæus mentions the same epithet, and gives us the anecdote which explains the origin of it; and as far as I know, with the exception of Dr. Lempriere, who, if he has taken any notice at all of him, has compassionately called him a native of Chalcis, Dionysius has been known, from the time of Aristides down to the present day, by the title of the “Man of brass.”

<sup>g</sup> Rhet. lib. III. c. 2. §. 3. Plut. in Nic. c. 5. p. 345. Athen. lib. XV. c. 9.

Salmasius seems to have supposed that the advice of Dionysius was adopted; for he says<sup>h</sup> that brass was minted by the Athenians in the archonship of Callias, in the 81st Olympiad: but the words of Athenæus are, διὰ τὸ συμβουλευῖν τῶν Ἀθηναίων χαλκῷ νομίσματι χρῆσασθαι; and the existence of the epithet is a plain indication that the advice of Dionysius was not acceptable to his countrymen.

We have, however, in the passage already quoted from the *Βάτραχοι* of Aristophanes, a sufficient notice, both that the experiment, of adulterating the coin by means of copper, was actually made in the time of that poet, and that a more powerful satirist even than the dean of St. Patrick's had proclaimed war against it. It appears also from the *Ἐκκλησιάζουσαι*<sup>i</sup>, which was exhibited thirteen years afterwards, that the crier had recently given notice of the issue of a new silver coinage, and the total suppression of the baser currency.

So that, as we may fairly collect, the Athenians determined upon restoring their currency to its ancient and salutary condition, as soon as they had recovered, even in a slight degree, from the disasters of the Peloponnesian war. They accordingly coined the minute silver pieces, already noticed; which are also most easily accounted for,

<sup>h</sup> De usur. p. 569.

<sup>i</sup> Ver. 816.

on the supposition that they were intended to supply the places of coins previously minted from a less precious metal. It is probable, however, that the small brass money, equal to  $\frac{1}{8}$  of an obol, was still retained. In later times, money was again minted of this metal, and established itself permanently in the circulation of Athens. Aristotle<sup>k</sup> records an equivoque, which shews that it was then in common use as small coin; and Demosthenes<sup>l</sup> employs the word *χαλκοῦς* in such a manner, as to prove that in his time it was the constant medium of smaller traffic.

Brass coins of Athens are very numerous, and the number has, in many cases, been much increased by the addition of others, which belong either to her dependencies, or to places united with her by commercial treaties, and adopting her devices. There are several medals, for instance, bearing the usual Athenian emblems, and inscribed with the words ΑΘΗΝΑΣ ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΥ, but possessing little accordance in metal and execution with the acknowledged coins of Athens. Now it would not be difficult, and Eckhel has in fact accomplished it, to bring together much various learning, for the purpose of shewing that Pallas and Victory were often identified in the cere-

<sup>k</sup> Rhet. III. 9. 4.

<sup>l</sup> Πρὸς Φαῖν. p. 1045. Κατὰ Διονυσ. p. 1283.

monies and the language of the Athenians. But, in this instance, it would be to little purpose; for the coins have been discovered, not in Attica, but in the neighbourhood of Pergamus; and on some of them there is the monogram of Pergamus<sup>m</sup>, together with the rest of the inscription, clearly proving that they are not of Athenian origin.

But numerous as the brasses are, it is not easy to assign any of them to a precise date. The inscription, as far as I know, confines itself to the letters, in full or in part, of the word ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ; and though the devices are very various, referring too in many instances to the history or topography of Athens, they do not enable us to assign any precise date for their being minted. There have been writers, indeed, who have discovered on these medals the likenesses of Themistocles<sup>n</sup> and other illustrious men, but without any evidence sufficient to satisfy a reasonable mind, and with the strongest probabilities against them. I shall therefore content myself with describing two coins, the first belonging to the collection of M. Pellerin<sup>o</sup>, the second noticed by Heeren<sup>p</sup>. 1st, *Caput Palladis* )—( ΑΘΗΝ *Rupes, super qua tem-*

<sup>m</sup> See Sestini, tom. I. lett. 26. p. 135. and Miommet, vol. II. p. 130.

<sup>n</sup> See Haym, tom. I. and Corsini's Answer, vol. II. p. 249.

<sup>o</sup> Eck. vol. II. p. 216. See Col. Leake's Attica.

<sup>p</sup> Bibl. der alten Lit. IX. 48. Eck. vol. II. p. 217.

*plum, juxta statua Palladis et porta, ad quam gradus per rupem ducunt.* 2nd, *Caput Palladis* )-( ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, *Vir nudus toto nisu prægrandem lapidem erigit.* The former bears a beautiful representation of the Acropolis; the latter refers to the fable of Theseus removing the stone which covered the sword and sandals of his father Ægeus.

From the well-known policy of Lacedæmon it will not be expected that I should enter into much detail respecting the currency of that country. Nevertheless we learn from Thucydides and Xenophon that the Lacedæmonians became well acquainted with the necessity and the value of money before the close of the Peloponnesian war; from Plato<sup>q</sup>, that they possessed a greater quantity of gold and silver than any other Grecian state; and from Pausanias<sup>r</sup>, that they were always notorious for assailing their enemy by means of bribes. We have moreover many coins in silver and brass which have been ascribed to Lacedæmon, some probably from possessing the Dioscuri, the favourite emblem of that country, others from the stronger evidence of the inscription ΑΑ. Many of them bear the names of ephori and other public officers; but, with the exception of two, both of them silver, they may all be left without farther

<sup>q</sup> Alcib. I. vol. V. p. 44. Bip.

<sup>r</sup> Lib. IV. c. 17.



notice, as either devoid of historical interest, or belonging to periods comparatively recent. The first is described by Dutens<sup>s</sup> as bearing *Caput Palladis* )-( ΛΑ *Hercules nudus petræ leonis exuviis coopertæ insidens. d. clavam*. The coin is of high workmanship, and is assigned by Dutens himself, but without any authority, to so early a period as the reign of Agesilaus. It appears to me that we are still in want of accurate information respecting it. The other coin bears *Caput Herculis imberbe leonis exuviis tectum* )-( ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΠΕΟΣ *Jupiter sedens, d. aquilam s. hastam*. This king Areus is supposed by Froelich<sup>t</sup>, who wrote a long dissertation on the coin, to be the Spartan Areus, who died in the year 265 B. C. having, according to the first book of Maccabees<sup>u</sup>, addressed a letter to Onias the Jewish high-priest, and stated that the “Lacedæmonians as well as the Jews were of the stock of Abraham.” However that may be, the coin in question is for many reasons an object of great suspicion.

The coins of Bœotia are known partly by their inscriptions, and partly by the presence of the Bœotian shield, which has not yet been discovered on any coin belonging to a different district. It

<sup>s</sup> Explic. de Méd. p. 27.      <sup>t</sup> Access. ad num. Reg. p. 1.

<sup>u</sup> 1 Mac. xii. 21.

is well known that the Bœotians had a kind of national pride in retaining their ancient style of armour, and this feeling was so much respected in other parts of Greece, that, as we learn from Demosthenes<sup>x</sup>, the great painting in the Ποικίλη of Athens, which represented the Plataeans in the act of bringing up their reinforcements at the battle of Marathon, exhibited them in their Bœotian helmets. A coin has been noticed by Froelich, which he describes as follows: *Clypeus Bœoticus*)—(EPX *intra coronam spiceam*. Now, in despite of the Bœotian shield, Froelich assigns this coin to the hamlet of Erchia in Attica, because he was unable to find any town in Bœotia corresponding with the letters of the inscription: Eckhel<sup>y</sup> objects, by alleging the presence of the Bœotian shield, and confirms his objection by mentioning another coin in the Hunterian museum, which reads EPXO in its inscription, and proves, by the additional letter O, that it cannot be assigned to Erchia. But this eminent antiquary was himself in error in supposing that the inscription has no reference to place, but, after the manner of other coins of Bœotia, is the abbreviated name of some public officer. It is in truth the ancient method of writing the word Orchomenus<sup>z</sup>,

<sup>x</sup> *Karà Neau*. p. 1377.

<sup>y</sup> Vol. II. p. 196.

<sup>z</sup> See Rose, *Inscr. Græc.* p. 271. and Osann, *Inscr. Fasc.* IV. p. 186.

a well-known town of Bæotia; and this fact is established by a marble found near the spot, and containing a decree of the Orchomenians, which has been described by me in my lectures on Greek inscriptions.

Another coin of the same country, and belonging to the same valuable museum, possesses a still greater interest, from the light it throws upon a perplexing passage of Xenophon. In his Grecian History<sup>a</sup> he states that a body of Arcadians joined Epaminondas against the Lacedæmonians, and expresses himself, according to our best editions, after the following manner: ἐπεγράφοντο δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἀρκάδων ὁπλίται ῥόπαλα ἔχοντες, ὡς Θηβαῖοι ὄντες. These words are translated by Leunclavius, “ Nonnulli “ etiam Arcades gravis armaturæ pedites nomina “ dabant gestantes clavas, perinde ac si Thebani “ essent.” Now this translation involves two insuperable difficulties. The word ἐπεγράφοντο cannot mean *nomina dabant*, for ἐπιγραφῇ, though very similar in sound, is extremely remote in meaning from ἀπογραφῇ: and it is moreover monstrous to suppose that the Arcadians, and much more so that the Thebans, in the highly advanced condition of Grecian tactics, should imitate the Hercules of the fable, and carry no other weapon than a club. The real meaning of ἐπεγρά-

<sup>a</sup> Lib. VII. c. 5. §. 20.

φοντο is *bore a device*, as we also observe in a similar expression of the Ἀχαρνῆς :

Καὶ γὰρ σὺ μεγάλην ἐπεγράφου τὴν Γοργόνα <sup>b</sup>.

But a difficulty still continues. If we read the passage with all past editors, ἐπεγράφοντο ῥόπαλα ἔχοντες, we must understand that the soldiers had the device of Arcadians armed with clubs on their shields, like the bearer of the firebrand on the shield of Capaneus in the Septem Thebani <sup>c</sup>: but if, on the authority of some good MSS., and in exact accordance with the expression of Aristophanes, we omit the word ἔχοντες, we obtain the following translation; “The Arcadian Hoplitæ “had clubs as devices upon their shields, after the “manner of the Thebans.” The proposed change of reading is singularly confirmed by the following coin of Thebes, ΘΕ *Caput imberbe Herculis* )—(*Clypeus Boeoticus, cui inserta clava.*

Elis is the only remaining state of Greece, whose coins I intend to notice. And till a late period Elis has been treated with singular injustice. It could scarcely be supposed that a country which stood so high in the estimation of the ancient world, should have been entirely destitute of coins, and it was thought one of the most remarkable anomalies of this branch of knowledge that no

<sup>b</sup> Ver. 1094.

<sup>c</sup> Æsch. S. T. 434.

such specimens had been found. But what was in reality the case? A number of coins, bearing the inscription *FAAEION*, had been known to the older numismatic writers, and from their ignorance of the digamma, and their neglect of the Doric dialect, had been strangely assigned to the Falisci in Etruria. Misled by the opinion of their predecessors, but too wise to adopt all the absurdities connected with it, Eckhel and some of his contemporaries still endeavoured to find out reasons for supposing these coins to have been minted by the ancient Tuscans. Sestini was the first to throw off the long-established error, being convinced from their being uniformly found in Greece, that they could not have been minted by so distant a people as the Falisci; but he was unfortunate enough to fall into as great a mistake as the one from which he had escaped<sup>d</sup>. He ventured to suggest, as Froelich seems also to have done, that they came originally from Phalerum, the harbour of Athens. After much uncertainty Payne Knight<sup>e</sup> explained to them that the first letter was the ancient Greek digamma, that the second was the Doric H, and that the whole word *FAAEIOIS* is to be seen, without the slightest difference, in the well-known inscription that was

<sup>d</sup> Sestini, tom. II. p. 10.

<sup>e</sup> Payne Knight, *Class. Jour.* 13. See also Rose, *Insc. Græc.* p. 29. and Boeckh. *Corp. Insc.* vol. I. p. 26.

found at Elis. All subsequent writers have joined with Eckhel and Sestini <sup>f</sup> in holding forth the absurdity of the ancient error, and the certainty of the modern interpretation.

<sup>f</sup> Eck. vol. II. p. 265. Sestini, tom. V. p. 44.

## LECTURE VI.

ROMAN coinage—Pliny's account of it—Inconsistency of that account—Extreme variations of standard at Rome—Pecunia—Supposed meaning of the word—Disputed—Real meaning—Illustrated from the coins of other countries—Particularly of ancient Gaul—First known devices of Roman coins—Variety of brass coins—Tokens of their current values—Silver coins—When first minted—Their current values how distinguished—Gold coins—Pliny's account of them—Disputed—Livy and Polybius—Restituti of Trajan—Opinion of Eckhel—Triumviri monetales—Triumviri mensarii—Cicero's letter to Trebatius—Anecdote of Julius Cæsar—Coins of Roman families—Likenesses on coins—The head of Roma—Explained—Restituti—Serrati.



**T**HE early history of the Roman coinage is given by Pliny<sup>a</sup> in his Natural History at considerable length, but in such a manner as to create no little doubt as to the correctness of it. It may be comprised, with a view to the distinct consideration of it, under the following heads.

Roman money was first stamped in the time of Servius ; it was of brass, and was called pecunia, from the figure of a pecus impressed upon it.

Its earliest form was the as libralis, or piece of twelve ounces ; and so continued till the time of the first Punic war. The denarius of silver was introduced about the year 259 B.C., five years before the commencement of that war ; and, as the word itself implies, was equivalent to ten asses.

The as was reduced to a sextantarius, or piece of two ounces, at some time during the first Punic war ; and so continued till a further change was made by Q. Fabius Maximus, about the year 216 B.C.

In the time of Fabius the as became uncialis, or piece of one ounce ; and the denarius, which

<sup>a</sup> Lib. XXXIII. §. 13. See also Letronne sur l'Eval. des Mon. p. 17.

had hitherto been equivalent to ten asses, was now made equal to sixteen.

In a short time afterwards, on the passing of the Papirian law, the date of which is not precisely known, the as became *semuncialis*, or piece of half an ounce in weight.

Now my first observation upon this reputed history regards the extreme greatness and suddenness of the reductions made in the intrinsic value of the coin. Confining ourselves for the moment to the change effected during the first Punic war, and making all due allowance for the difference between the simple habits of exchange existing at that period, and the highly artificial notions contracted by ourselves, we still find that the measure recorded by Pliny must have been too generally disastrous to the wealthier orders, to have been attempted by the government successfully and at once. Its tendency would certainly be to reduce all property, entrusted to other persons and payable in money, to one-sixth of its former value. The relative prices of commodities in general would either remain stationary, or would soon recover from the first disturbance; but all the engagements, whether of debt, of bargain, or of service, that had been previously contracted, would be fulfilled, to the inevitable ruin of the one party, and without any necessary profit to the other. Suppose a senator to have lent 6000

asses, on the condition that he should receive the same sum on repayment, and the customary interest during the interval; and suppose the change in the currency to take place a few days afterwards; the borrower converts 1000 of these asses into coin of the new denomination, and finds them sufficient to pay off the whole of his debt. But suppose that more than a few days have elapsed, and that the borrower has no longer any of the ancient and heavier coin in his possession; the readjustment of prices has taken place, the lender suffers in the same ratio in which the prices are advanced, and the borrower continues exactly as he was before. But the mention of the denarius in silver, which is stated to have been issued some few years previously to the change, adds greatly to the difficulty. The denarius seems still to have been equivalent to only ten asses, and could not possibly continue in circulation, when it would purchase six times the quantity of asses, by being converted into bullion. At a subsequent period, indeed, this inconvenience appears to have been felt; but how was it obviated? The as, in the time of Fabius, was reduced in weight of brass to an ounce; and the denarius, to go on concurrently with the alteration, was declared equal to sixteen asses. And yet, in point of fact, and in despite of this supposed adjustment, the inequality was still greater than before; for the denarius, which was

intrinsically worth 120 ounces of brass, was, as current money, worth only sixteen; and so, by the operation of minting, was reduced to  $\frac{1}{7}$  of its real value. In this argument I have only assumed, what I am fully justified in doing, that the ratio established between the two kinds of coin, when silver was originally minted, was the ratio of their real value; and that the denarius, no information being given us to the contrary, and strong presumptions existing in favour of the supposition, continued of the same standard throughout the whole period. But the strongest objection against the statement of Pliny still remains. If his account were correct, no as could ever have been minted of a weight between the libralis of the earliest period, and the sextantarius of the Punic war; nor in like manner any semisis between the full weight of six ounces, and the reduction to one single ounce; whereas the fact is, that we meet with both these coins in all the several stages of degradation, proving incontestably that the change was gradual. That such changes were actually made, and that the common currency of Rome underwent repeated, and at last extreme variations in its standard, is a fact that might certainly be anticipated from the unscientific character of the times, from the demands of a constant state of warfare, and even from the universal prevalence of debt; but this fact is fully

established, as to the mode and extent of its operation, not by what we gather from history, but by what is clearly laid before us in a series of coins.

There is still another point in the narrative of Pliny, to which it is necessary to advert. He says that money was called pecunia from the pecus that was impressed upon it; and the construction put upon this is, that originally the coin was intended to be a substitute for the pecus represented on it, in the business of exchange<sup>b</sup>. Now, as the fact of stamping a piece of metal, in order to make it a legal tender, implies a certain degree of advancement in the science of money; and as before that time it must have been clearly seen that no one piece of money whatever can constantly purchase the animal impressed upon it, it is probable that wherever such impressions appear on early coins, they were introduced with some other reference than to point out an object that was equivalent to them. It is probable also, from the known habits of infant communities, and still more so when those communities were predatory tribes, that the devices first adopted by them were borrowed either from the fables of their country, or from their own military exploits. Those fables, moreover, might already have af-

<sup>b</sup> Such is the construction given by Sperling and others.

forded them objects of religious worship, and their military exploits might also have been depicted in some rude decoration upon their arms ; and thus a favourite emblem would already be in existence, and, if so, would have an irresistible claim to be impressed upon their coinage. As the readiest discovery made by individuals is of their own virtues, so too the first step taken by an infant community is to deify some rude quality that they are proud of. That they are quick in discovering such a quality, is owing, no doubt, to the feeling, inseparable from their nature, that they were made for themselves ; that they deify that quality, is owing to another feeling, which is, if possible, still more inseparable from them, that they were not their own makers.

I must not refer you, in illustration of these opinions, to the emblems which I have already spoken of as belonging to civilized periods ; although, in some instances, they may be traced back to the first origin of their respective communities, and cannot, I think, in any of those instances, have any possible reference to the theory of exchange. I need not ask whether the lion of Leontium, or the cock of Himera, the bull with a human head of Campania, or the flying horse of Corinth, would be a badge, adopted for the first time, at a civilized period ; or if otherwise, could possibly, when represented on a coin, denote an

object to be purchased by it. But I will dwell for a moment on the early coins of Gaul, as furnishing us with the best specimens we possess of a rude period and a primitive money. The usual devices on these coins are horses and boars<sup>e</sup>; and that they had no connexion with traffick, but denoted either the fierceness of the Gauls in combat, or, at the lowest, the most valuable kind of property they possessed, may be seen by reference to their history. Strabo<sup>d</sup> says of them, “They are all warlike by nature, but they are still more serviceable as horsemen than as foot-soldiers.” Pliny<sup>e</sup> says, that in the Roman army boars were carried as insignia before the lines; and Tacitus<sup>f</sup>, in speaking of the tribes bordering on the Baltic, is a most valuable witness as to the meaning of the emblem; “insigne superstitionis, formas aprorum gestant. Id pro armis omnique tutela; securum Deæ cultorem etiam inter hostes præstat<sup>g</sup>.”

<sup>e</sup> The usual devices of the coins of Gaul are horses and boars; but there are many which bear a naked head on the one side, and a figure in a biga on the other. These are thought to have been stamped in imitation of Macedonian coins, brought back about 280 B. C. by the troops of Brennus, which had been serving in Macedon and Greece. See Eck. vol. I. p. 63.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. IV. p. 273. Ed. Ox.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. X. §. 5.

<sup>f</sup> De mor. Ger. c. 45.

<sup>g</sup> A boar was the well-known cognizance of the 20th le-

But returning from this digression to the early coinage of Rome, we may observe, that if a “pecus” were the first device impressed upon it, there is no known specimen of it in existence. The earliest and the prevailing devices<sup>h</sup>, so far as examples will carry us, are the head of Janus on the one side, and on the other the prow of a ship; and it is to these devices, as being of the earliest period, that we find the strongest testimony borne by a constant pastime of the Romans, which was no bad indication of a primitive custom, and continued to exist long after the custom itself was abandoned. “Ita fuisse signatum,” says Macrobius<sup>i</sup>, in speaking of the devices I have mentioned, “hodieque intelligitur in aliæ lusu, quum pueri ‘denarios in sublime jactantes *‘capita aut navia’* ‘exclamant.”

As the weight of the coin was diminished, it gion, and was also a device of Spain; in which country the legion appears to have been originally levied. Horseley, in his Brit. Rom. p. 194, in explaining the figure of a boar, which he found inscribed upon an ancient monument of the 20th legion, has forgotten that it was the cognizance of the troops by which the monument was erected, and has supposed it to represent the native Caledonians.

<sup>h</sup> There is an as described by Eckhel (vol. V. p. 10.) bearing the head of Pallas on the one side, and on the other a bull; but the presence of the head of Pallas shews that this coin is of a more recent period.

<sup>i</sup> Saturn. lib. I. c. 7.



would naturally make room for the introduction of other coins of a higher denomination than any previously minted, but containing a smaller quantity of the same metal than would have accorded with the original standard. It is probable indeed, however gradual might be the change, that the great alterations made in the weight of the as, whilst the denarius continued stationary, would in time occasion the silver to disappear from the circulation ; and the inconvenience that would thus be gradually coming on, would give rise to the issuing of other brass coins of a higher denomination than the as, and preserving a constant and real relation to it. Of this description are the dupondius, the tripondius or tressis, the decussis, and other multiples, the remaining specimens of which, as far as I have seen, bear the *Caput Palladis*, or some other device more recent than the time of the denarius, and intimate thereby that they were designed for some purpose which the denarius was no longer able to fulfil.

The variations in the value of the coin would also give rise to a peculiarity which we had no occasion to notice in the coins of Greece. There was nothing by which its conventional value could be known, unless some token were impressed upon it for that especial purpose. To apply the words of Cicero, “Jactabatur temporibus illis numus, sic “ut nemo posset scire, quid haberet<sup>k</sup>.” It had

<sup>k</sup> Cic. de Off. III. 20.

not adhered to past and well-known precedent ; and though the head upon the obverse appears to have varied according to a constant law<sup>1</sup>, that would scarcely be a sufficient indication of the value that was given to it. Like those ancient paintings therefore, in which figures, coarsely executed, are compelled to tell their history by labels issuing from their mouths, the coins of this fluctuating currency had numbers, or other tokens, impressed upon them to denote their legal values. The as being always the unit, the several multiples were stamped with their corresponding numbers ; the semissis bore the letter S, the quincunx the letter Q, the triens, the quadrans, and other smaller portions of the as, bore round balls agreeing in number with the ounces respectively represented by them. And as in the present instance, so too in many others, this addition to the bearings of a coin may be considered as evidence, not so much of attention to public convenience, as of previous disorder and bad government.

Silver money, as we learn from the testimony of Pliny<sup>m</sup> and others, was first minted at Rome about the year 269 B. C., five years before the

<sup>1</sup> The as bore the head of Janus, the semissis that of Jupiter, the triens that of Pallas, the quadrans that of Hercules, the sextans that of Mercury, the uncia that of Pallas ; and all bore on the reverse the prow of a ship.—Eck. vol. V. p. 11.

<sup>m</sup> Plin. lib. XXXIII. §. 13. Liv. Epit. lib. XV.

commencement of the first Punic war. The time clearly points out the circumstances which gave occasion to it, in the conquest which had recently taken place of the south of Italy, and the spoils obtained by the Romans from provinces long celebrated for their skill in the fine arts, and their commercial enterprise. The Roman coins of this metal were the denarius, (approaching so near to the Attic drachma<sup>n</sup>, as to bear to it the ratio of 8 to 9,) the quinarius, and the sestertius. The libella, or piece of a single as, is noticed by Plautus, Cicero<sup>o</sup>, and other authors; but, probably on account of its smallness, and the abundance of copper money, it was not in general circulation; and I am not aware that any specimen of it has hitherto been found. It appears that all the silver coins had originally the same impression, and their values were distinguished by figures after the manner of the brasses; but distinct devices appear to have been adopted in later times. Livy<sup>p</sup>, we know, in speaking of denarii, uses the term *bigati* to denote them; and Cicero<sup>q</sup>, in like manner, the word *victoriati*, as the customary name for quinarii.

I will not speak of the method of computing by the sestertius, as the subject does not properly

<sup>n</sup> Eck. vol. V. p. 18.

<sup>o</sup> Cic. in Ver. lib. II. c. 10.

<sup>p</sup> Lib. XXXIII. c. 23.

<sup>q</sup> Pro Font. c. 5.

belong to my inquiry; and is, moreover, too familiar to you to need any explanation.

Pliny again is our authority for supposing a gold coin to have been minted at Rome during the progress of the war with Hannibal, and about the year 207 B. C. He calls it a denarius, not because it corresponded with the silver denarius in weight, but merely from its size. And there are, in fact, some few gold coins extant of an age anterior to the time of Julius Cæsar, and commonly alleged in justification of Pliny's narrative. But, on the other hand, the extreme paucity of these coins, especially when taken in reference to the magnitude of the republic, may naturally give rise to some degree of suspicion. It is certainly surprising that, in the course of 150 years, there should not have been coins sufficient to yield an abundant harvest to modern collectors, if gold were actually issued at the beginning of that period. It is possible, no doubt, that such coins may have been minted in abundance, and may either have totally perished, or may some of them be discovered hereafter; and the anomaly is certainly not greater than others which have already been acknowledged. But there is still no assignable reason why we should have so copious a supply of gold coins from Macedon, from Sicily, from Magna Græcia, and even from Cyrene, and many of them of a higher date, when we are destitute

of Roman gold for so long an interval, and so extensive a dominion. I say there is no assignable reason, and till some reason be discovered, the fact establishes a presumption against the correctness of Pliny's narrative. This presumption again is greatly increased by the total silence of Livy, who wrote expressly of the period at which this gold is said to have been minted, and yet makes no mention whatever of it; and on a subsequent<sup>r</sup> occasion, when he mentions the terms imposed upon the Ætolians, and says, "Dum pro argenteis "decem aureus unus valeret," appearing to state that gold coins were then actually current, he probably would have been more accurate, had he described the ratio by weight, and not by tale, after the manner of Polybius<sup>s</sup>, τῶν δέκα μνῶν ἀργυρίου χρύσου μνᾶν διδόντες. A farther evidence may be found in the case of the coins already noticed under the name of *restituti*. Trajan seems to have had a great pleasure in restoring coins, not only of the emperors, his predecessors, but also of the republic, stamping them in every instance with his own "restituit." We know that he restored gold coins of the empire, as well as silver; but when we come to his *restituti* of the republic<sup>t</sup>, we meet with specimens in the latter metal only, and none whatever in the former.

<sup>r</sup> Lib. XXXVIII. c. 11.

<sup>s</sup> Hist. lib. XXII. c. 15.

<sup>t</sup> Mém. de l'Acad. tom. XXIV. p. 205.

In this argument I have been following the steps of Eckhel, and am disposed to think, with that eminent antiquary, that gold did not make part of the common circulation of the Romans till about the time of the first triumvirate; always admitting that the coins of Macedon and other foreign states were current among them, and that Philippei are often mentioned by Plautus, as if they were common money in his time.

And this leads me naturally to consider at what time and with what powers the triumviri monetales were appointed, the title of whose office connects itself with the minting of gold: "auro argento æri flando feriundo;" for if these officers, with the title commonly given to them, were in existence at the early period at which some writers have supposed, it will also be evident that gold coin was minted by them long before the time of the first Triumvirate.

Pomponius <sup>u</sup> states expressly that the triumviri monetales were appointed at the same time with the triumviri capitales; and this latter office, we have reason <sup>x</sup> to believe, is of a date as early as the year 288 B.C., and therefore twenty years earlier than the first introduction of silver into the currency of Rome. And yet Pomponius calls these officers *æris argenti auri flatores*, speaking of them at a time when it is admitted that nei-

<sup>u</sup> De Orig. Jur. leg. 2.

<sup>x</sup> Liv. lib. II. Epit.

ther silver nor gold was minted by them. I will not attempt to apologize for him by alleging the more remarkable anachronism of Lactantius<sup>y</sup>, who mentions 300 Philippi as the price demanded by the Sibyl from Tarquinius Priscus; but, rejecting the statement of Pomponius as of no authority, I will endeavour to obtain more satisfactory information from some other quarter. We know that in the earliest periods of the Roman history all the business of the revenue was transacted by the quæstors; but we find from Livy<sup>z</sup>, that in the year 215 B.C., soon after the battle of Cannæ, Triumviri mensarii were appointed “propter penuriam argenti.” It is probable that the new duties of providing bullion, (duties which had grown up with the increasing difficulties of the times,) had required that the exchequer or banking department should be taken away from the quæstors, and entrusted to a new and separate board. At this period, therefore, the Triumviri mensarii, although themselves a newly-severed branch of the executive government, united the two distinct offices of the public moneyers and the public accountants. And this view of the case not only accords with that distribution of employment which we know is gradually going on, as the wants and resources of a country are gra-

<sup>y</sup> De Fals. Rel. c. 6.

<sup>z</sup> Lib. XXIII. c. 21. See also Solin. de Usuris, p. 510.

dually increasing, but it is also strongly confirmed by a subsequent passage of Livy<sup>a</sup>, in which the consul Lævinus exhorts the senate to carry the rest of their gold and silver, and all the brass that they had in money, to the *Triumviri mensarii*; the gold, apparently, that it might be employed by them in barter, the silver that it might be minted by them, and the brass that it might be issued for their immediate wants. But however this may be, the first authentic notice that we meet with of *triumviri monetales*, as a separate board, discharging the simple office of moneyers, is in a letter of Cicero<sup>b</sup> addressed to Trebatius, then near Treviri in Gaul; who says to him, playing on the name of the town, "*audio capitales esse, mallem auro ære argento essent.*" The inscriptions indeed on some of the coins themselves in which these officers are denoted by the letters AAAFF, or others of like import, are probably of older date than the epistle to Trebatius; but that is the earliest instance to which a date can be assigned, and that is not earlier than about the year 53 B. C.

The number of these officers appears to have

<sup>a</sup> "*Ceterum omne aurum, argentum, æs signatum, ad triumvirov mensarios extemplo deferamus.*" Liv. lib. XXVI. c. 36.

<sup>b</sup> Epist. ad Fam. lib. VII. c. 13. See also de Leg. lib. III. c. 3.



been increased to four by Julius Cæsar; and if his historian is to be credited, he gave them at the same time a novel occupation. Suetonius<sup>c</sup> informs us that he took three thousand pounds of gold privately from the capitol, and replaced the sum with the same quantity of gilded brass. The ancient number was restored by Augustus, and they appear at that time to be merely the managers of the mint, and to be employed alike for all kinds of money, whether issued by the emperor or by the senate.

But their title, though it does occasionally occur, is not found so frequently as we might expect to find it, on the money that they issued; and it appears that when sums of money were voted for distinct services, the senate granted the corresponding weight of bullion, and the coin was issued from the mint with the titles and the emblems of the public officer, whether prætor, or ædile, or quæstor, or proconsul, to whom the service was entrusted. It is to this arrangement that we owe the coins of Roman families, a class of specimens belonging to the most valuable and the most intricate periods of Roman history, and impressed with its most illustrious names; but which, nevertheless, from its total want of dates, is calculated to gratify the inquirer rather by re-

<sup>c</sup> Jul. cap. 54.

ceiving illustration from the facts of contemporary history, than by imparting it.

And this leads me to consider the devices that appear upon this class of coins; and in so doing, I shall be concerned with silver pieces only, as the brasses adhered to their ancient insignia, and the gold coins are too few or too doubtful to be noticed.

It has already been observed, that a biga was so common an emblem on the denarius, and a figure of Victory on the quinarius, as to give corresponding appellations to them; and yet, in this latter instance, there have been writers who have endeavoured to find some historical meaning for the emblem, and to assign every quinarius that they meet with, to some real victory. But besides these customary emblems, the obverse presents heads of deities, of genii, and of ancient worthies, in all possible variety, connected, no doubt, by real or by fanciful relation, with the family of the public officer, for whose service they were minted. Without an accompanying inscription it is not always easy to identify the emblem; but with such assistance we can clearly make out the resemblances of Honor, Triumphus, Moneta, Libertas, Pietas, Fides, Concordia, and other unreal personages, and we have as certainly the countenances of Quirinus, Numa, Ancus, and the earlier Brutus, as they presented themselves

to the imaginations of their remote descendants. Cæsar seems to have been the first whose head appeared upon the public money during his own lifetime ; and for this act of sovereignty even Cæsar was contented to obtain the authority of the senate. The example was followed, but, as far as we know, without the same authority, by Antony and Lepidus and Octavianus, and even by the liberator Brutus.

But the head which appeared in the first instance upon the Roman silver of every denomination, and for a long time had undisputed possession of it, is *Caput muliebri galeatum alatum*. For a considerable length of time this was taken without inquiry as representing the genius of Rome, and the word ROMA, which frequently accompanied it, was supposed to be conclusive as to its identity. But it is observed in answer, that the word ROMA is also found united with Apollo, or Hercules, or Saturn, and must therefore be admitted to have no necessary connexion with the figure that it accompanies. We see moreover that in any ancient monument which is known to bear the form of Roma, the wings, which are in reality the characteristic token, are wanting. Eckhel supposes the head to be Pallas, but is obliged to have recourse to some questionable evidence to account for the wings. It appears to me that the whole may be explained in the following manner.

By the conquest of the southern provinces of Italy the Romans obtained at once a taste for new refinements, and the means of gratifying it. Silver, indeed, had long been employed by them for useful as well as ornamental purposes in their households, and also as a medium of exchange by weight in dealings of considerable amount. But being now imported into Rome in immense quantities, it sunk greatly and rapidly in value, compared with all other commodities, and began to be used more generally as a medium of exchange, and in much smaller dealings. The circumstances of the case therefore created the necessity for a silver currency; and the coin obtained from the southern provinces was already in the treasury, and well-fitted, if not to constitute the issue that was wanted, at least to furnish a model for it. Now the coins of Athens had long been known throughout the Mediterranean as the best medium of traffick, and in many of the towns upon its coasts had supplanted the native money, even in the common dealings of the inhabitants. And so remarkably was this the case in the towns of Magna Græcia, that there are few of them on whose coins we do not find, at some period or other, one at least, and in some instances both, of the well-known emblems of Athens. The coins of Athens in short were like her citizens, extending themselves by their enterprise into every

part of the civilized world, and obtaining, wherever they settled, the highest places of rank and opulence. Tarentum, for example, which afforded to the Romans the proudest and the most costly triumph of the whole period, admitted upon its coins the *Caput Palladis* on one side and the *Noctua* of Athens on the other, inscribing its proper name ΤΑΡΑΣ to accompany them, but contented to abandon its own ancient emblems in order to receive them. And yet Tarentum was connected politically with Lacedæmon rather than with Athens, and is therefore a proof, so much the more forcible, of the ascendancy of Athenian commerce. Now suppose these coins to have been received in considerable quantity at Rome, and suppose the Romans anxious to retain the badge of the conquered provinces, or, if you will, the insigne of Grecian commerce, and to place it in conjunction with their own national devices; it was a thought well calculated at once to gratify the liberality of science, and to flatter the pride of victory. To make the reference therefore as pointed as was possible, the wings are taken from the noctua of the one side to be added to the helmet of the other, the two Athenian emblems are combined in one Roman trophy, and being received at first as a new bearing, become in a short time the distinguishing device of the Roman coinage.

Of special devices and inscriptions I shall speak

at considerable length hereafter, when I treat of coins of families and of emperors in detail.

A class of coins has already been mentioned in connexion with questions of some importance, and distinguished by the name of *restituti*. They are found in all the three metals, and, as far as we have yet discovered, the gold and silver were minted in almost every instance by Trajan, generally in exact accordance, but sometimes, as it would seem, slightly differing from some earlier coin either of a preceding emperor, or of the time of the republic. In addition to their earlier impress they bear a circular legend of Trajan and his various titles, terminating with the four first letters of the word RESTITVIT. In some instances possibly he impressed this legend on coins already in existence; in others he employed the ancient coin as a model for the formation of a new die, and with so much exactness, as to retain the private stamp of the older coinage, or some antiquated mode of spelling, or even some deformity in the ancient workmanship: but there are also cases in which new dies appear to have been cut with deviations from the older pattern. The brass *restituti* were minted by his predecessors in the empire, Titus, Domitian, and Nerva; and there is a peculiarity belonging to them, which has already been noticed as belonging to the gold *restituti*, but which in this instance has certainly arisen

from some different cause. There are no *restituti* of brass coins of the republic ; and this may be explained, without affecting the argument constructed on the like absence of all gold *restituti* of the same period, by observing that the brass coins of a remote date would, in all probability, have changed their original value, or even have totally lost it, and could not be restored for the purpose of taking their ancient place in a modern currency<sup>d</sup>.

The *serrati* are another description of coins, and may be introduced by a quotation from Tacitus<sup>e</sup>. Speaking of the ancient Germans, he says, “ Pecuniam probant veterem et diu notam, serratos bigatosque.” And this would seem to be another instance, and at an earlier period, of the suspicion entertained by the barbarians of Roman dishonesty, and of the caution exercised by them in avoiding it. The Germans clearly preferred the ancient denarii, on account of their intrinsic value and their long established reputation. They probably had learnt to notch the money, after the

<sup>d</sup> Eckhel has ingeniously applied this class of *restituti*, as a method of trying the good faith of Goltz. Of the many impressions of coins given by that writer, and depending on his sole authority, it might be expected that some one would be the only archetype remaining of a subsequent *restitutus*. But that is not the case.

<sup>e</sup> De Mor. Ger. c. 5.

## LECTURE VI.

manner of a saw, in order to satisfy themselves that it was not plated; and so in process of time the Romans were induced to mint denarii in that manner for their use. However that may be, the contrivance was certainly adopted at the Roman mint, and was, as far as we know, confined exclusively to silver denarii<sup>f</sup>; and having been introduced apparently about eighty years after the first issuing of silver, was discontinued before the time of the empire. Cautious as the Germans were, they found, in course of time, that they were deceived by the reliance they had placed on their favourite and rude criterion. The Roman forgers supplied them with denarii of plated copper provided with the proper indentations, and *serrati* of this description are still remaining, as evidence at once of the cunning of our barbarian forefathers, and the united cunning and dishonesty of their civilized masters.

<sup>f</sup> Even in the time of Tacitus the Germans continued to prefer silver to gold, “*argentum quoque magis quam aurum sequuntur*,” (De Mor. Ger. c. 5.) and this perhaps may be considered a sufficient token that gold was not issued at so early a period as is supposed by Pliny.



## LECTURE VII.

ROMAN coins considered in detail—Coins of Families—  
Accoleius Lariscolus—M. Lepidus—M. Lepidus, Pont. Max.  
—Truth of inscription disputed—Marcellinus—Spinther—  
Supposed origin of the name—Disputed—Real origin con-  
jectured—Mamilius Limetanus—A passage of the Odyssey—  
Thorius Balbus—Bos irruens explained—Two quinarii of  
Marc Antony—Foundation of Lyons—Heraldic badge of  
Antony—Dissertation on beards—Antony represented as  
Bacchus—His entry into Athens—Flattery and wit of the  
Athenians.

I COME now to a detailed consideration of Roman coins, selecting my specimens as they may seem calculated either to throw light upon questions of history and literature, or to diversify the general sameness of my subject. The coins of families must be taken without any reference to the order of time, from the total want of materials for assigning dates to them; but the coins of the empire will be considered in chronological succession.

P·ACCOLEIVS·LARISCOLVS *Caput muliebre* )—( *Tres virgines adversæ stantes in arbores mutantur.* Arg.

Now the gens Accoleia is, as far as I have yet discovered, unknown to history, excepting through the medium of this denarius, and one ancient inscription in the collection of Gruter; and in proportion therefore as there seems little to be learnt, so is the antiquary the more anxious to investigate. It appears to me not improbable that Accoleius was of the colony of Aquileia, which, as we learn from Livy<sup>a</sup>, was founded on the Adriatic in the year 181 B.C., and afterwards became a place of considerable importance. The name of the family implies of itself some probable connexion

<sup>a</sup> Liv. XXXIX. 54. and XL. 34. and XLIII. 17. See also Sil. Ital. VIII. 604.

with it; but the supposition is much strengthened by the cognomen Lariscolus, and the device which accompanies and elucidates it. The three females evidently refer to the fable of the three sisters of Phaeton and the neighbourhood of the Po, and the word Lariscolus, *a laricibus colendis*, shews still farther the connexion of the family with that neighbourhood, and with the shores of the Adriatic. Vitruvius<sup>b</sup> says of the larix, “Non est notus, nisi his municipibus qui sunt circa ripam fluminis Padi et maris Adriatici litora.” He also<sup>c</sup> states that the wood is not easily ignited; so that we may doubt whether the word, which we commonly translate *larch*, does not really include a species of poplar. This we certainly may believe; that the ancients were not quite agreed as to the kind of tree which grew out of the transformation, Virgil<sup>d</sup> himself in one passage declaring it to have been a poplar, and in another an alder.

Gens Æmilia.

*Caput muliebre* )—( M·LEPIDVS·AN·XV·PR·  
H·O·C·S *Eques lento gressu s. tropæum gestat.* Arg.

It is not known to which of the many members of the illustrious family of Lepidus this denarius

<sup>b</sup> Lib. II. c. 9.

<sup>c</sup> Lib. II. c. 9. See also Pliny, lib. XVI. c. 10.

<sup>d</sup> Æn. X. 190. Eck. VI. 63.

is to be assigned ; but the inscription is evidently to be completed in the following manner : Marcus LEPIDVS ANnorum XV. PRætextatus Hostem Occidit Civem Servavit. If this interpretation rested on conjecture only, it would still have much probability in its favour ; but it is fully established by the following passage of Valerius Maximus <sup>e</sup> : “ Æmilius Lepidus puer etiam tum progressus in  
“ aciem hostem interemit, civem servavit. Cujus  
“ tam memorabilis operis index est in capitolio  
“ statua bullata et incincta prætexta, S C posita.”

ALEXANDREA *Caput muliebre turritum* )—  
M·LEPIDVS·PONT·MAX·TVT·TOR·REG·  
S·C *Lepidus togatus stans regi togato ad-*  
*stanti et d. hastam tenenti diadema imponit.*  
Arg.

It seems evident from this denarius, that a Lepidus was commissioned by the Roman senate to act as guardian to a king of Egypt. Tacitus <sup>f</sup> also mentions the fact as having occurred long before his time ; “ majores M. Lepidum Ptolemæi liberis tu-  
“ torem in Ægyptum miserant.” But Valerius Maximus <sup>g</sup> and Justin describe it with more precision : the words of the former are, “ quum Pto-  
“ lemæus rex tutorem populum R. filio reliquis-  
“ set, senatus M. Æmilium Lepidum Pont. Max.  
“ his consulem ad pueri tutelam gerendam Alex-

<sup>e</sup> Lib. III. c. 1. n. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Ann. II. 67.

<sup>g</sup> Lib. VI. c. 6. n. 1.

“andriam inisit.” Exact as this description is, it is yet a matter of some doubt which of the many Ptolemies was the one, whose son was placed under the guardianship of Rome; but the opinion adopted by Usher has the strongest evidence in its favour, that Ptolemy the Fourth, surnamed Philopator, was the father, and Ptolemy the Fifth, surnamed Epiphanes, was the young king confided to the care of the Romans. Now Philopator died in the year 203 B. C., and Lepidus therefore must have been sent to Alexandria soon afterwards.

But on the other hand Livy<sup>h</sup> informs us that two years afterwards, immediately after the close of the second Punic war, M. Æmilius Lepidus and two others were sent to the king of Egypt, to announce the success of the Romans, and to offer their thanks for the continued attachment of the king under circumstances so full of danger to them. It appears<sup>i</sup> also that Æmilius was the youngest of the three commissioners, and moreover that Licinius<sup>k</sup> was Pontifex Maximus at that time. We find also, from a fragment of Polybius<sup>l</sup>, that upwards of thirty years afterwards, when the son of Epiphanes sent commissioners to Rome, and complained of the loss of territory, which his crown had suffered during the minority

<sup>h</sup> Lib. XXXI. c. 2.

<sup>i</sup> Liv. lib. XXXI. c. 18.

<sup>k</sup> Liv. lib. XXXI. c. 9.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. XXVIII. c. 1.

of his father, M. Æmilius was the person under whose advice they acted. Upon the whole, if Livy and Polybius are to be heard, it is probable that Æmilius was not appointed guardian to Epiphanes, although he might be present as the representative of Rome at his coronation ; and it is certain that at that period he was not, as Valerius calls him, bis consul, for his first consulship was not till sixteen years afterwards ; much less was he, as both Valerius and the coin describe him, Pontifex Maximus. The difficulties of the case have increased till it would appear that there was no possible method of escaping from them ; and I certainly know no method of doing so, unless I may suppose it to be an example of what I have already stated in the words of Cicero<sup>m</sup>, “ laudationibus historia rerum nostrarum facta est mendosior.” I suppose then that Æmilius was sent to Egypt to congratulate the young king on his taking the government into his own hands, and that this office was a little magnified in the records of the Æmilian family, under the description of *tutor regis*. I suppose too this denarius was minted by some one of his descendants, who was desirous of recalling the memory of his illustrious ancestor, either merely from the feeling of family importance, or with a view to promote some am-

<sup>m</sup> Brut. c. 16. See Lect. II.

bitious project of his own. And a most favourable occasion of this latter kind did actually occur in the year 43 B. C., when Lepidus<sup>n</sup> the triumvir was ambitious of becoming Pontifex Maximus, and Antony was compelled to have recourse to artifice, in order to obtain his appointment to the office. Under such circumstances, what would be more probable, than that Lepidus would join in the deception, and prepare the minds of his countrymen for his appointment to the disputed office, by exhibiting to them the former services and honours of his family? These suppositions are utterly at variance with the questionable narratives of Valerius and Justin, and the direct authority of Tacitus; but they accord with the information, such as can be obtained, from Polybius and Livy, and the coin itself, being capable of a reasonable explanation in either case, may fairly be considered neutral.

Gens Claudia.

MARCELLINVS *Caput virile imberbe nudum ; pone triquetra* )—( MARCELLVS·COS·QUINQ *Templum quatuor columnarum, ad quod vir velatus et togatus accedit tropæum gestans.* Arg.

This medal will shew more clearly than the

<sup>n</sup> Liv. Epit. lib. CXVII. c. 8. See also lib. CXXIX. c. 30.



preceding one, that it was a practice of the Roman nobles to recall the memory of their forefathers in the devices of their own coins. Its reverse clearly refers us to the illustrious Marcellus, who, during his first consulship, obtained the *spolia opima* in Gaul, and offered them up in the temple of Jupiter, (the third instance of the kind since the days of Romulus,) and in his fifth consulship died in battle, being deceived by the stratagems of Hannibal. But the best commentary upon the device is in the words of Virgil<sup>o</sup> :

Aspice, ut insignis spoliis Marcellus optimis  
Ingreditur, victorque viros supereminet omnes.  
Hic rem Romanam magno turbante tumultu  
Sistet eques, sternet Pœnos, Gallumque rebellem,  
Tertiaque arma patri suspendet capta Quirino.

That the obverse is a continuation of the same subject, we may infer from the triquetra, or three legs united, which clearly alludes to some important transaction in Sicily, and may best be explained by the celebrated conquest of Syracuse obtained by the same Marcellus. We may reasonably suppose, therefore, that the head on the obverse was a likeness of this distinguished warrior, taken, it may be, from a statue in the possession of his family, and impressed upon the public money by some one of his descendants. This

person was evidently the Marcellinus of the obverse; and the name implies some one of the Marcelli, who had been adopted into another family, and had, according to the Roman custom, added the proper termination to his former name. It appears, from a passage of Cicero<sup>p</sup>, that such an adoption was made into the gens Cornelia and the family of Lentulus; and we also find that a Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus was consul in the year 56 B.C., and another of the same name forty years afterwards. To one of these the medal now before us may fairly be assigned.

And this leads me to the mention of another member of the same gens Cornelia.

*Caput nudum barbatus; pone OSCA* )-(  
P·LENT·P·F·SPINT *Vir barbatus velatus  
seminudus sedens in sella curuli d. cornu  
copiæ s. hastam, et d. pede globo insistens  
coronatur ab adrolante Victoria. Arg.*

It cannot be uninteresting to inquire into the history of a Lentulus who was an important actor at the most critical period of the falling republic, and of whose services to himself Cicero<sup>q</sup> could speak in the following emphatic language: "P. "Lentulus consul, parens, deus salutis nostræ, "vitæ, fortunæ, memoriæ, nominis, simul ac de

<sup>p</sup> In Brut. c. 36.

<sup>q</sup> Ad Quir. Post. Red. c. 5.

“ solenni religione retulit, nihil humanarum rerum  
“ sibi prius quam de me agendum judicavit.”

The devices are not calculated to give us much assistance, but the inscription on the reverse clearly denotes Publius Lentulus Publii Filius Spintlier, at a time when he does not yet appear to have been consul ; and the word *Oscæ*, the ancient name of a city in Spain, would imply that the coin was minted whilst Lentulus was acting as pro-prætor, or other public officer, in that province. Now we know that he was pro-prætor in Spain in the year 58 B. C., and we find him, on a subsequent occasion<sup>r</sup> endeavouring to conciliate Cæsar, as Thetis<sup>s</sup> conciliated Jupiter, by enumerating the many favours which Cæsar had bestowed upon him, mentioning especially his appointment to the Spanish province, and afterwards the assistance afforded him in his canvass for the consulship. It appears, therefore, from these notices combined, that Lentulus had the name of Spintlier before the year of his consulship, the memorable year in which he obtained the recall of Cicero from his banishment.

I mention this fact, in order to introduce an anecdote which is to be found, more or less largely told, by Valerius Maximus<sup>t</sup>, Pliny, and Quinti-

<sup>r</sup> Cæsar. B. C. 1. 22.

<sup>s</sup> Arist. Eth. Nic. 4. 3. 25.

<sup>t</sup> Val. Max. IX. 13. Pliny, VII. 10. Quint. vol. I. p. 377.

lian; and which, like many other anecdotes, appears to have owed its credit rather to its point than to its authenticity. According to Valerius, (and all of them seem to have derived their information from the same authority), in the year when Lentulus and Metellus were consuls, there were two actors on the Roman stage, to whom they bore so strong a resemblance, that Lentulus was ever after called Spinther from the one, and Metellus would also have been called Pamphilus from the other, had not his extravagant habits already obtained for him the more appropriate epithet of Nepos. Now this anecdote, although it appears to have been credited at Rome, is open to every possible objection. It is known that Nepos was already a family name of the Metelli, and therefore was not given to this consul on account of his own habits: it is clear also from the coin, that Lentulus had the name of Spinther before the year of his consulship; and it is incredible, however unanimous the populace might be in giving him the appellation, that Lentulus, an ambitious man, and of the gens Cornelia, would have been proud of his resemblance to a stage-performer, and have willingly adopted a new name as a memorial of it. The converse is more likely to have been the case, and the actor might more reasonably be supposed to have contracted the well-known name of the consul. There are instances,

indeed, of Roman emperors, such as Caligula and Caracalla, who are better known to us by popular appellations than by their own names; but there are no instances in which they themselves adopted the spurious honour, or inscribed it on their coins in preference to their own patrician titles.

Having, I think, shewn that there is much reason for doubting the correctness of the anecdote, which seems to have been received without suspicion by Valerius, Pliny, and Quinctilian, I may perhaps be expected to supply its place with some more probable account of the first introduction of the name of Spinther into the family of the Lentuli. The word itself signifies an armlet or collar, and being so used by Plautus, was doubtless a word commonly employed in his days. I might suppose, then, some accident to have occurred in the patrician circles of Rome, somewhat similar to the case which is said to have given rise to the English order of the Garter; and I might leave the rest to be supplied by the imagination of my hearers. But something more may be said upon the subject. The name of Torquatus had long been known among the proudest titles of Rome, and, under the influence of modern refinement, conveyed associations as remote from its original meaning, as the manners of the times of Cicero were different from those of the first Torquatus. The progress of the arts might easily have sub-

stituted a costly decoration for the rude badge of the torquis, and public opinion going on concurrently with the change, and forgetting the warlike qualities implied in the ancient title, would connect the honours of the family with the appearance of the modern decoration. Any Roman ambitious of the same distinction, but prevented from taking the title of Torquatus, might be supposed likely to assume another name (such as Spinther) in the place of it, which had the same kind of splendid ornament connected with it, and, according to the interpretation of modern manners, conveyed much of the same actual importance. That the title itself was an object of general ambition may be shewn from Suetonius<sup>u</sup>, who states that Augustus bestowed it, together with a gold torquis, upon a person who had been injured, as a compensation for what he had suffered; and it appears from Dio<sup>x</sup>, that the very Lentulus of whom we are speaking, was so partial to the title, that, though unable to assume it himself, he shewed that he preferred it to any of the celebrated names of Rome. Wishing to obtain admission for his son into the college of augurs, but being prevented by the law, which prohibited any two persons of the same gens from being members of that body at the same time, his best method was to have his son adopted into a different family, and

<sup>u</sup> Suet. vol. I. p. 284. c. 43.

<sup>x</sup> Lib. XXXIX. c. 17.

he selected the family of Manlius Torquatus for his purpose.

I may now proceed to the consideration of another coin.

Gens Mamilia.

*Protome Mercurii; pone litera Alphabeti* )—  
C·MAMIL·LIMETAN. *Vir curto habitu,*  
*tectus pileo rotundo, s. scipionem habens*  
*graditur; ei adblanditur canis.* Arg.

The appearance expressed in the words *curto habitu* suggests the notions of poverty and hardship; the *pileo rotundo* might remind us of Mercury, or some one of his descendants; the *scipionem habens* implies fatigue and wandering; the *adblanditur canis*—whom can all these circumstances represent, but the Ulysses of the Odyssey, the reputed offspring of Mercury, returning to his ancient home?<sup>y</sup>

πτωχῷ λευγαλέῳ ἐναλίγκιος ἡδὲ γέροντι,  
σκηπτόμενος· τὰ δὲ λυγρὰ περὶ χροῖ εἴματα ἔστο.

And again:

ἂν δὲ κύων κεφαλὴν τε καὶ οὐᾶτα κείμενος ἔσχευ  
"Αργος Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος, ὃν ῥά ποτ' αὐτὸς  
θρέψε μὲν οὐδ' ἀπόνητο.

So then, even at this period, the study of Homer was so popular at Rome, that his poetry had appeared on the escutcheons of private families.

<sup>y</sup> Odyss. XVII. 337. and XVII. 29.

But though in this instance the picture drawn by Homer was probably adopted by some one of the Mamilii possessing a more refined taste than the rest of his kindred, we have reason to know that the whole family were proud of their descent from Telegonus and Ulysses. A native of Tusculum, the “Telegoni<sup>z</sup> juga parricidæ,” and one of the most distinguished of its citizens, Lucius Mamilius, migrated to Rome in the dictatorship of Quinctius Cincinnatus, and became the founder of several consular families. That they continued to keep up the tradition of their heroic origin is evident from the notice taken of it by Livy<sup>a</sup>, where he mentions the Mamilius, the son-in-law and friend of the younger Tarquin: “Is longe princeps Latini nominis erat, si famæ credimus, ab Ulixē deaque Circe oriundus.”

The first of the family<sup>b</sup> who bore the name of *Limetanus* was tribune of the people in the year 164 B. C., and carried a new law, “de limitibus gerendis,” which seems to have given occasion to the name.

Gens Thoria.

I·S·M·R *Caput Junonis Sispitæ* )—( L·THO-  
RIVS·BALBVS *Bos irruens; superne va-*  
*rians Alphabeti litera.* Arg.

<sup>z</sup> Hor. Od. III. 29.

<sup>a</sup> Liv. lib. I. c. 49.

<sup>b</sup> See Pighii Ann. vol. II. pp. 392 and 490.



It is a sufficient reason for commenting upon this denarius, that Cicero<sup>c</sup> has left us an admirable description of the character and fortunes of Balbus. “L. Thorius Balbus fuit, Lanuvinus; quem  
 “meminisse tu non potes: is ita vivebat, ut nulla  
 “tam exquisita posset inveniri voluptas, qua non  
 “abundaret: erat et cupidus voluptatum, et cu-  
 “jusvis generis ejus intelligens, et copiosus: ita  
 “non superstitiosus, ut illa plurima in sua patria  
 “sacrificia et fana contemneret; ita non timidus  
 “ad mortem, ut in acie sit ob rempublicam in-  
 “terfectus.—Color egregius, integra valetudo,  
 “summa gratia, vita denique conferta voluptatum  
 “omnium varietate.” The letters on the obverse are the initials of Juno Sispita Magna Regina; and the attachment of Balbus to the worship of that goddess, or, to speak more correctly, his adoption of such a bearing for his coins, was clearly owing to his connexion with Lanuvium<sup>d</sup>, a place celebrated for the worship of Juno. Even in later times, Antoninus Pius and Commodus, who were born at Lanuvium, shewed the same respect for the goddess of their native place, by preserving her image on their coins<sup>e</sup>. But the *Bos irruens*, on the other face of the medal, is

<sup>c</sup> Cic. De Fin. lib. II. c. 20.

<sup>d</sup> See Ælian de Nat. An. lib. XI. c. 16. Cic. de Nat. Deor. lib. I. c. 29.

<sup>e</sup> See Eck. vol. VII. pp. 14 and 107.

not so easy of explanation. Some writers suppose it to have a reference to the Agrarian law, which was carried by Balbus, when he was tribune, in the year 106 B. C. : but as *irruens* is not properly descriptive of the quiet employments of agriculture, and is not the form usually taken for that purpose, I am disposed to adopt the suggestion of Eckhel, who thinks that the *Bos irruens* is a punning allusion to the prænomen Thorius, or Θούριος, in the same manner in which I have already explained the similar bearings of the town of Thurium.

I have now to consider two quinarii of Marc Antony.

*Protome Victoriæ alata* )-( LVGV DVNI·A·XL  
*Leo gradiens.* Arg.

IIIVIR·R·P·C *Protome Victoriæ alata* )-( AN-  
 TONI·IMP·A·XLI *Leo gradiens.* Arg.

It is evident from the coins themselves that they were minted at Lyons ; and we learn from an inscription found at Gaëta<sup>f</sup>, on the tomb of Munatius Plancus, and from the more precise narrative of Dio<sup>g</sup>, that Lepidus and Plancus were employed by the senate in founding the colony of Lugudunum, in the year 43 B. C. This was a little more than a year after the assassination of Julius Cæ-

<sup>f</sup> Gruter, p. 439. n. 8.

<sup>g</sup> Dio C. lib. XLVI. c. 50.

sar; and, in a few months from this time, Antony, who had previously sought refuge with Lepidus in Gaul, entered into the well-known triumvirate against Brutus and Cassius, and obtained the greater part of Gaul, including Lyons, as his province. We may readily admit, therefore, that these quinarii were among the first productions of a mint, which is noticed by Strabo<sup>h</sup>, within fifty years afterwards, as issuing both gold and silver, on account of the extensive commerce of the neighbourhood. We may be confident that they were issued within three years from the foundation of Lyons; as, after that period, Antony was constantly occupied in the east, and Octavianus had succeeded him in the province of Gaul.

And this degree of uncertainty as to the time will still continue to attach to them, until we are able to assign the date, which actually appears upon them, to some known and certain epoch. At a subsequent period, as I have already stated, the battle of Actium was often taken as the fixed point for the chronology of the empire; but we know of no similar epoch that was received by the Romans at an earlier period. In the present instance, moreover, we can find no event in the history of the republic which would at once cor-

<sup>h</sup> Lib. IV. p. 266.

respond with this date, and be important enough to stand forth, from the confusions of the time, to be commemorated at any subsequent period. So that we are compelled to look to some æra connected with the local history of Lugudunum, and in so doing we naturally lose much of the interest belonging to the subject as a question of general chronology.

But here again we meet, at the very outset, with an insuperable difficulty. It appears that, before the establishment of the colony by Plancus, there was no town existing upon the spot, nor any thing which could have given a history or an epoch to the neighbourhood. In the absence therefore of all other explanation, it has been supposed that the date refers to some event in the life of Antony himself; and, in defence of this opinion, the number is calculated, according to the narrative of Plutarch<sup>i</sup>, to coincide exactly with the years of his age. It was certainly a greater refinement in adulation, which, some few years afterwards<sup>k</sup>, induced several towns of Italy to date the commencement of their year from the day on which Augustus first visited them. The supposition would have been more probable, had the name of Antony appeared upon the first of the two coins, and so connected the date by ex-

<sup>i</sup> Ant. c. 86.

<sup>k</sup> See Suet. Octav. c. 59.

press reference with his history: but it is also possible, and it is consistent with the many tokens we have met with of the prevalence of heraldry in ancient times, that the *Leo gradiens* was commonly known as the badge of Antony, and pointed him out as intelligibly as the actual letters of his name. He certainly did claim to be descended from Hercules, and might therefore be expected to take a lion as his bearing; it was only five years previously<sup>1</sup>, on his return from the battle of Pharsalia, that he entered the city with lions yoked to his chariot; and you will remember the words of Cicero to Atticus<sup>m</sup>, “Tu Antonii leones “pertimescas cave,” where he speaks of lions as if they always suggested the recollection of Antony, and leads us to connect them with his well-known love of parade and ostentation.

The words *Triumvir Reipublicæ Constituendæ* require no explanation; *Imperator* will be explained hereafter; and whatever opinion may be formed of the interpretation given to the date, it seems generally admitted that the heraldic bearings and the present name of the modern city are both of them derived from the lion of Antony, impressed by him upon his coins, and upon other public memorials of his government.

<sup>1</sup> Pliny, Nat. Hist. lib. VIII. c. 21. and Plut. Vit. Ant.

<sup>m</sup> Epist. ad Att. X. 13.

I might now entertain you with a dissertation on beards, and shew you, from the coins of Antony, Pompey, Brutus, Octavianus, and others, how common it was to wear long beards at this period. In many instances it seems intended to denote sorrow for the troubles of the republic; in others, as in the cases of Julius Cæsar and Antony, it was the token of some particular vow, waiting for its fulfilment. But I will conclude the Lecture with noticing another coin of Antony, which was minted after he had contracted Asiatic tastes, and places him before us in a new character.

M·ANTONIVS·IMP·COS·DESIG·ITER·ET·  
TERT *Caput Antonii hedera redimitum; infra lituus; omnia intra coronam hederaceam*  
)-( IIIVIR·R·P·C *Cista Bacchi inter duos serpentes, cui imminet caput muliebre nudum.* Arg.

So then the natural disposition of Antony, which Cicero has described as partaking more of the love of ease and indulgence than of warlike qualities, had been fully developed in the luxuries of the east, and, like the well-known character in the Frogs of Aristophanes, had thrown off the emblems of Hercules, and appeared in the more appropriate attributes of Bacchus. But before I make any further observation upon this change, I must notice the words *Consul Designatus Iterum*

*et Tertio.* They plainly shew that the ancient practice of appointing consuls for the coming year, and for that year only, had been abandoned, and some other method had been adopted, which disposed of public office for several years in advance. We can easily conceive that in those times of peril it was necessary to secure the cooperation of powerful and ambitious partisans. We can also conceive the dangers of the times to be so great, and the strife of party to be so ready to exaggerate them, that, conscious only of their present peril, the leaders of the day might be totally indifferent to the ultimate inexpediency of their measures. Their present resources being exhausted, they anticipated the future strength of the republic. They mortgaged the honours of the state, as modern governments have mortgaged their incomes; and they would no doubt have been as lavish of the incomes, as they were of the honours, of their descendants, if commercial credit had been a thing intelligible at Rome.

We find accordingly, that in the year 38 B. C., when the triumvirate still existed, but the government was evidently in great want of support, consuls were appointed at once for the eight following years, and that the years 34 and 31 B. C. were assigned to Antony. It is clear, then, that this coin was minted between the year 38 B. C., when this appointment was made, and the year 34, when

he would no longer be elect, but actually in office, for the second time. It is admitted also, from its emblems of Bacchus, which seem to have been peculiar to the east, that it was minted in Asia. Perhaps no date is more reasonable than the year 38 B.C., in which farther triumphs were obtained by his troops over the Parthians, and Herod the Great was established by him on the throne of Judæa. It was in the preceding winter that he resided at Athens; and, on his arrival there, the circumstances occurred, which are noticed by Seneca<sup>n</sup> in the following manner: “Quum Antonius  
 “vellet se Liberum patrem dici, et hoc nomen  
 “statuis subscribi juberet, habitu quoque et comi-  
 “tatu Liberum imitaretur, occurrerunt venienti  
 “ei Athenienses cum conjugibus et liberis, et Διό-  
 “νυσον salutaverunt. Bene illis cesserat, si nasus  
 “Atticus ibi substitisset. Dixerunt despondere  
 “ipsi in matrimonium Minervam suam, et roga-  
 “verunt ut duceret. Ac Antonius ait ducturum,  
 “sed dotis nomine imperare se illis mille talenta.  
 “Tum ex Græculis quidam ait κύριε, ὁ Ζεὺς τὴν μη-  
 “τέρα σου Σεμέλην ἄπραικον εἶχε.” “Sir, your father  
 “Jupiter got no fortune, when he married your  
 “mother Semele.”

<sup>n</sup> Sen. Suasor. lib. I. p. 5.



## LECTURE VIII.

ROMAN coins of the empire—Two coins of Augustus—Great roads of Italy—Tiberius—Twelve cities of Asia destroyed—Tacitus—Phlegon—Marble discovered at Pozzuoli—Germanicus and Agrippina—Lesbos—Caligula—His popularity—Claudius—Britain—Nero—The closing of the temple of Janus—Tacitus and Suetonius—Galba, Otho, and Vitellius—Brasses of Otho.

IN treating of imperial coins, I shall begin with a gold coin of Augustus, minted in the year 27 B. C. This was four years after the battle of Actium, and two years after the closing of the temple of Janus, and at a time when, foreign hostilities and civil discord being at an end, all men were looking forward to the establishment of some lasting form of government. It was at the beginning of this year therefore that Octavianus prudently abandoned the intention of taking the name of Romulus, and obtained, with the approbation of the senate and the people, the new and solemn title of Augustus. Dio furnishes us with a long oration which, he says, Augustus read to the senate, on the occasion when they conferred the sovereign power upon him, and describes the different feelings which actuated his hearers, making them all concur in commending his moderation and submitting to his government. Studiously avoiding any title which might create suspicion or bring back painful recollections, he accepted the sovereign power conferred upon him, and promised to resign it at the expiration of ten years, or even at an earlier period, if good order should have previously been established throughout the empire. The gratitude of the senate was de-

clared, as we learn from the same historian <sup>a</sup>, by decreeing that laurels should be placed before his house in the Palatine, and an oaken garland suspended from it, in token at once of the conquest obtained over his enemies, and the benefits conferred upon his countrymen. It is to this decree that Ovid refers <sup>b</sup>, when he addresses the laurel in the following words :

Postibus Augustis eadem fidissima custos  
Ante fores stabis, medianque tuebere quercum ;

and it is to the same decree, and with the same distinctness, that reference is made, in the medal which I now describe to you.

CAESAR·COS·VII·CIVIBVS·SERVATEIS  
*Caput nudum* )—( AVGVSTVS·S·C *Aquila  
expansis alis coronæ quernæ insistens; pone  
duo lauri rami. Aur.*

My next coin is a denarius of the same reign, but minted eleven years afterwards, and within a year after the celebration of the Ludi Sæculares. We might expect it therefore to contain some notice of the title of authority permanently adopted by the emperor, and of the municipal improvements which he had already been able to accomplish.

<sup>a</sup> Dio, lib. LIII. c. 16.

<sup>b</sup> Ovid. Metam. I. 562.

AVGVSTVS·TR·POT·VIII *Caput nudum*)—(  
*Cippus, cui inscriptum* S·P·Q·R·IMP·CAE·  
 QVOD·V·M·S·EX·EA·P·Q·IS·AD·A·DE; *in*  
*orbem* L·VINICIVS·L·F·IIIVIR. Arg.

This is the first mention we have met with of the TRibunica POTestas, the title of authority adopted eight years previously by Augustus, and which had evidently been selected by him for the purpose of conciliating the popular party in the state. The title itself is of so much importance in the chronology of the empire, that I shall reserve it for a distinct consideration. But the *cippus* impressed on the reverse would seem likely at first sight to defeat all the endeavours we might make to interpret it; and certainly were we to take a casual sentence from Cicero or Tacitus, retaining only the initials of the several words, it would form a problem which none but skilful men could investigate, and even the skilful themselves would work out into different solutions. But, on the other hand, we must remember that an inscription of such a nature, if it were inexplicable to a modern reader, would also offer no small difficulties to a common Roman; and that no person, whose object it was to be understood, would purposely take the surest method of making himself unintelligible. So that we may assume the existence of other circumstances, known so familiarly in the days of Augustus, that they

would be present to the mind of every Roman, and assist him in the interpretation of this and similar inscriptions.

And this opinion is confirmed on the first examination of the inscription itself. It is clearly a decree of the senate and people, which was inscribed in brief on the base of some statue or other monument erected in honour of the emperor, and had doubtless been made known in the usual public manner as a law of the empire. But it had still stronger claims than these on general notoriety. It was a vote of approbation, similar to many others which had been passed before, and probably expressed in a customary form of words. To judge therefore, as easily as a Roman might, of the meaning of such abbreviations, we must be as well acquainted as he was, with encomiums and honorary tablets, and with the public services which commonly obtained such tokens of remembrance. To a Roman the letters V·M·S would clearly denote *Viæ Munitæ Sunt*, and that the rest of the inscription was also familiar to him, may be shewn from the very words of a *Senatus-consultum*, quoted by Livy as having passed in the second Punic war, and expressed, no doubt, according to the established usage; “*rente*” *P. Scipione, senatus consultum factum*

<sup>c</sup> Liv. lib. XXVIII. c. 38. See also lib. XXXVII. c. 57.

“ est, ut quos ludos inter seditionem militarem in  
 “ Hispania vovisset, ex ea pecunia quam ipse in  
 “ ærarium detulisset, faceret.” The whole inscription, therefore, is as follows<sup>d</sup>: *Senatus Populus Que Romanus IMPeratori CAEsari QVOD Viæ Munitæ Sunt EX EA Pecunia Quam IS AD Aerarium DETulisset.* The legend running round it is of the *IIIVIR monetalis*, who, during that year was, together with his colleagues, the master of the mint. But the word *imperator* is now used in a new manner, not having, in this instance, the signification of commander, as before, or referring to the number of times that he was saluted under that title by his troops, but conveying the new notions of civil government expressed by the word emperor.

And what could be a more favourable occasion for inscriptions than the formation or re-establishment of a military road? Running through several important cities, provided with bridges over the streams, and buildings at stated intervals for the reception of travellers, and decorated in many instances with works of sculpture and triumphal arches, they presented to the Romans of all periods, from the time of Appius to the latest years

<sup>d</sup> It is even possible that Livy, who was writing his history at the time when this coin was minted, may have filled up the *senatus-consultum* of the time of P. Scipio with words taken from the public proceedings of his own time.

of the empire, the most tempting opportunities for recording their names and public services. In the present instance, the Flaminian way had been restored by Augustus ; and, as Dio<sup>e</sup> informs us, triumphal arches, surmounted with the statue of the emperor, were placed at its two extremities. The *cippus* on the coin is probably copied from the tablet of the arch which stood upon the bridge of the Tiber ; and the coin itself may have been minted from one of the silver statues, which, the same historian tells us, were presented on the occasion to the emperor, and by him converted into coin.

My next specimen is a brass of Tiberius<sup>f</sup>.

TI·CAESAR·DIVI·AVG·F·AVGVST·P·M·  
TR·POT·XXIII *in medio S·C* )-( CIVI-  
TATIBVS·ASIAE·RESTITVTIS *Impera-*  
*tor togatus capite laureato sedens pedibus*  
*scabello fultis d. pateram s. hastam. Æn.*

The 28th year of the *tribunicia potestas* of Tiberius began in the 22nd year of the Christian æra ; and the event commemorated on this medal receives so much illustration from the writers of the time, and from surviving monuments, that no

<sup>e</sup> Dio. lib. LIII. c. 22.

<sup>f</sup> The inscription, written at length, is, Tiberius Cæsar Divi Augusti Filius Augustus Pontifex Maximus Tribunicie Potestatis 24.



doubt or difficulty attaches to it. It has been explained by Gronovius, in his *Thesaurus*<sup>g</sup>; by Schlegel, in Morell's *Thesaurus*<sup>h</sup>; by the Abbé Belley, and M. Le Beau, in the *Memoirs* of the French Academy<sup>i</sup>; by Eckhel, and by almost every other writer on the coins of the empire.

You will remember a remarkable passage of Tacitus<sup>k</sup>, where mention is made of an earthquake which destroyed in one night twelve cities of Asia. “Eodem anno duodecim celebres Asiæ  
“urbes conlapsæ, nocturno motu terræ; quo im-  
“provisior graviorque pestis fuit: neque solitum  
“in tali casu effugium subveniebat in aperta pro-  
“rumpendi, quia diductis terris hauriebantur.  
“Sedissee immensos montes, visa in arduo quæ  
“plana fuerint, effulsisse inter ruinam ignes, me-  
“morant.” He then proceeds to mention the cities which had suffered, and the bounty bestowed upon them by the emperor. This event took place in the 17th year of the Christian æra, and we must inquire therefore to what cause it was owing that the medal, which was clearly intended to commemorate the munificence of the emperor, was not minted till five years afterwards: and the more so, as we have another medal of similar inscription<sup>l</sup>, which was minted only two years after the

<sup>g</sup> Vol. VII. p. 446.

<sup>h</sup> Vol. I. p. 578.

<sup>i</sup> Vol. XXIV. pp. 130 et 152.

<sup>k</sup> Tac. Ann. II. 47.

<sup>l</sup> See Ac. Inscr. vol. XXIV. p. 129.

disaster had occurred, and when the bounty of Tiberius was fresh in every one's memory.

Now it might be a sufficient answer to observe, that some few years must necessarily have elapsed, before these towns could be again inhabited; and that five years, as we learn from Tacitus, was the term actually allowed, in the cases in which the emperor granted a remission of their taxes. We may also observe, that, in addition to the cities already noticed, Ephesus<sup>m</sup> appears to have suffered severely in the following year, and that the continuance of the danger would naturally retard the work of restoration. But this is not all. Phlegon, who lived probably in the days of Hadrian, mentions in his book *περὶ θαυμασίων* the destruction of the Asiatic cities, and informs us that a colossal statue of Tiberius was erected in the Forum Cæsaris<sup>n</sup>, with the figures of the several cities as an accompaniment to it, in honour of his munificence. Now what can be more reasonable, than that on the erection of this statue, an event which could

<sup>m</sup> And this fact will explain the apparent inconsistency between Tacitus and Pliny on the one hand, who say that twelve cities were destroyed; and Eusebius and other more modern writers on the other, who mention thirteen. See Morell's *Thes. Numism. Wessel.* vol. I. p. 579. The account of Nicephorus, who states the number to have been fourteen, will be explained in the sequel.

<sup>n</sup> See M. Le Beau, *Ac. Ins.* vol. XXIV. p. 158.

not well take place till some few years after the disaster, a new coin was struck by the senate, in token of their admiration? Meursius<sup>o</sup> indeed is of opinion that no such statue was ever erected at Rome, no one having been mentioned by any of the various older writers who have recorded the ravages of the earthquake. But Meursius was not acquainted with some farther testimony on the subject, which has been brought to light more recently. In the year 1693 a piece of marble was discovered at Pozzuoli, which had evidently been the base of a colossal statue, and was inscribed to the emperor Tiberius. Round it, in exact accordance with the words of Phlegon, are figures representing the several Asiatic cities, and described by their respective names; but in addition to the thirteen already noticed, we find another, representing the town of Cibyra in Phrygia. And in explanation of this, we learn from Tacitus<sup>p</sup>, that in the year 23 after Christ, Tiberius granted relief to Cibyra, which had recently suffered from an earthquake; and the marble itself shews, according to the date inscribed upon it, that it was not erected till the year 30. So that all these circumstances being taken in combination, it appears that, within two years after the great earthquake, the senate had determined to erect a statue to Tiberius, and had issued a new

<sup>o</sup> See his note on Phlegon, p. 161.

<sup>p</sup> Ann. IV. 13.

coinage, as a memorial of his bounty; that, within five years after the same event, the statue was completed, and a new die was cut, from which the medal we have been considering was minted; and that finally, in the year 30, when Tiberius had withdrawn himself from Rome, and was living in the neighbourhood of Puteoli, the inhabitants of that town erected another statue, after the model already exhibited at Rome; thereby expressing their sorrow for a calamity, for which their own volcanic country would teach them to feel compassion, and honouring at the same time the emperor's repeated acts of generosity. We may infer, that the seated figure on the reverse of the medal was intended to resemble that colossal statue of Tiberius, which we have traced from the time, when the plan of it was first adopted by the senate, to the time when it was finally erected at Puteoli.

And this is a favourable opportunity for noticing a Greek coin of Germanicus.

ΘΕΟΝ·ΓΕΡΜ---- ΜΥΤΙ *Caput Germanici nudum* )-( ΘΕΑΝ·ΑΙΟΑΙΝ·ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΝΑΝ·ΜΥΤΙ  
*Caput Agrippinæ. Æn.*

It is clear that this brass was minted at Mytilene in Lesbos, and equally clear that it commemorates two persons, whose names create as great an interest as any names connected with the history of

the empire. M. Pellerin<sup>q</sup>, who was the first to describe the coin, was of opinion that the word AIOAIN was a mistake of the graver for IOTAIAN; and maintained, but without quoting any authority in his favour, that Agrippina, the wife of Germanicus, had the prænomen of Julia. But here M. Pellerin has asserted what he is utterly unable to prove. He acknowledges that he can find no coin to support him; and when he says that Agrippina is known in history with the additional name of Julia, he probably confounds her with her daughter Agrippina, the wife of Claudius, who was certainly admitted into the gens Julia.

But groundless as is the argument in favour of the word IOTAIAN, it is not more so than the objection that was felt against the real reading, AIOAIN. It is natural to suppose that the Lesbians, who minted the coin, might also have enrolled Agrippina among their countrywomen, and so have styled her an Æolian; and the more so, as she resided for some time in the island, and had the strongest reasons for being attached to it. But the whole question is determined by an inscription, which Eckhel has adduced from the *Thesaurus*<sup>r</sup> of Muratori, representing Nero, the ill-fated son of an illustrious father, as ΠΑΙΔΑ

<sup>q</sup> Rec. de Méd. de Peup. vol. III. p. 229.

<sup>r</sup> Nov. Thes. vol. I. p. 228.

ΘΕΟΥ ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΘΕΑΣ ΑΙΟΛΙΔΟΣ ΚΑΡ-  
ΠΟΦΟΡΟΥ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΝΑΣ.

The other epithet<sup>s</sup> here given to Agrippina may have some reference to the event which occasioned her to reside at Lesbos, and gave rise to the attachment already noticed. It was in the year which preceded the death of Germanicus<sup>t</sup>, and when he was on his progress into the east, that he employed himself for some time in exploring the Adriatic and the Ægean, and in visiting places upon their coasts, distinguished in the history of his own or of other nations. He was accompanied by Agrippina, and after surveying the scene of the battle of Actium, and receiving the homage of the Athenians, they repaired to Lesbos, where Julia Livilla was born to them, the last addition to a family, which seems to have combined more splendour and degradation than any other family of Roman history. It was probably this event which caused a permanent connexion to subsist between Germanicus and the Lesbians, and gave occasion to the coin in honour of himself and Agrippina, which was issued from the mint of Mytilene.

The next is a brass of Caligula, minted by the senate in the year 39 after Christ.

<sup>s</sup> See the same epithet given to Julia, the mother of Tiberius.—Eckh. vol. VI. p. 168.

<sup>t</sup> Tac. Ann. II. 53, &c.

C·CAESAR·DIVI·AVG·PRON·AVG·S·C *Pileus libertatis* )-( COS·DES·III·PON·M·TR·  
P·III·P·P; *in medio* RCC.<sup>u</sup> Æn.

The titles which Augustus received reluctantly and by degrees, and some of which Tiberius obstinately refused, were all greedily accepted by Caligula; and the epithet of Germanicus, the only epithet which conferred real honour upon him, and which he had hitherto constantly retained, was in this year finally abandoned by him. In this year also, finding that his treasury was exhausted, and wearied with his residence at Rome, he proceeded into Gaul, on that memorable expedition which terminated in his descent upon the Northern ocean, and his conveyance to Rome of shells and pebbles to be the spoils and trophies of his conquest.

The *pileus libertatis*, an emblem of the popularity enjoyed at one period by Caligula, may possibly refer to the hopes which he created of the revival of the ancient Comitia<sup>x</sup>, and the readiness with which the Romans were led to expect that their former liberties would be restored to them. A less favourable interpretation is, that the Romans, having lost the knowledge of real freedom,

<sup>u</sup> Caius Cæsar Divi Augusti Pronepos Augustus Senatus-consulto. Consul designatus 3. Pontifex Maximus Tribunicie Potestatis 3. Pater Patriæ. Remissa Ducentesima.

<sup>x</sup> See Suet. Calig. c. 16.

were already contented to substitute in the place of it that love of shows and spectacles, which the emperor had been gratifying beyond all former example. But however this may be, the act which appears immediately to have given birth to this sense of freedom, is expressed in the letters RCC which appear on the reverse. They denote the words “Remissa ducentesima<sup>y</sup>,” and refer to the tax on all transfers of property, which, having been originally established at the rate of one per cent. by Augustus, had afterwards been reduced to a ducentesima, and was now abolished by Caligula. The words of Suetonius are “ducentessimam auct<sup>z</sup> ionum Italiae remisit;” and to shew that the abbreviated form of expression was intelligible at Rome, coins of Galba<sup>z</sup> may also be produced, bearing a similar abbreviation, and known to refer to a similar remission.

In illustrating the reign of Claudius, it is natural to select a coin connected with his victories in Britain.

TI·CLAVD·CAESAR·AVG·P·M·TR·P·VI·  
IMP·XI *Caput laureatum*)—(DE·BRITANN  
*inscriptum arcui triumphali, supra quem statu  
tua equestris inter duo tropæa. Aur. Arg.*

It is evident from the date given to the Trib.

<sup>y</sup> See Suet. Cal. c. 16. with the note of Baumgarten.

<sup>z</sup> See Eckhel, vol. VI. p. 296. col. 2.



Pot. that this coin was not minted before the middle of the year 46 after Christ, the sixth year of the reign of Claudius, although we know from Dio that a triumph for his victories in Britain had been decreed by the senate three years previously, and had actually been celebrated in the year 44. The coins however which bear our inscription are in gold and silver, and were therefore minted by the emperor; they were minted too, as appears from the reverse, in commemoration of the triumphal arch erected by the senate<sup>a</sup>, and therefore could not well be issued till some time had elapsed after his return from Britain. It is worthy of remark that, although Claudius was partial to the title of imperator, and even on some of his coins is styled IMP·XXVII, he uses it in no instance as a prænomen; confirming thereby the words of Suetonius<sup>b</sup>, who says expressly, “Prænomine imperatoris abstinuit,” but at the same time leading to the permanent abuse of the title, as a token of victory, by the frequency and absurdity of the occasions on which he adopted it.

IMP·NERO·CLAVD·CAESAR·AVG·GER·  
P·M·TR·P·P·P *Caput laureatum* )-( PACE·  
P·R·TERRA·MARIQ·PARTA·IANVM·  
CLVSIT *Templum Jani clausis foribus.*  
Aur. Æn.

The coins of Nero, bearing testimony to the clos-

<sup>a</sup> Dio, lib. LX. c. 22.

<sup>b</sup> Suet. Claud. c. 12.

ing of the temple of Janus, are many in number, are in both gold and brass, and evidently proceed from several different dies. The inscriptions are not sufficiently precise to admit of our assigning them with certainty to their proper dates, but their number and variety would seem to justify the opinion that they were minted at different periods. It might naturally be inferred therefore that the temple of Janus had either been closed on several different occasions, or at least had continued closed for several successive years, during the reign of Nero.

But this opinion, though the testimony of coins is strongly in its favour, is exposed to considerable objections from other quarters. In a fragment of Tacitus, preserved by Orosius<sup>c</sup>, and quoted by him as evidence of the fact, it is stated that the temple of Janus was opened in the old age of Augustus, and continued open till the reign of Vespasian. It is possible indeed that the historian may purposely have omitted the several occasions, on which the ceremony of closing the temple was performed by Nero, considering them as undeserving of historical record, because they were inconsistent with historical truth. And it must be admitted that no narrative, which derived the history of those times from the proceedings or the proclamations of the emperor, could justly be

<sup>c</sup> Oros. lib. VII. c. 2. See also Just. Lips. Ant. Lect. II. 8.

considered as a representation of real occurrences. Nevertheless, whatever opinion may be formed of the meaning of Tacitus, the existence of these coins will oblige us to admit that the temple of Janus was actually closed by Nero, and will also give us reason to suspect that the ceremony was performed by him frequently, and without sufficient warrant in the circumstances of the times.

But another important testimony is still to be produced. Suetonius<sup>d</sup> says of Nero, "*Janum geminum clausit tam nullo quam residuo bello,*" asserting that the temple was closed equally, whether there was or was not a reason for closing it. And this statement would seem to be in exact accordance with the opinion conveyed by the coins. The passage indeed is not without its difficulties; but when taken in connexion with the negative support of Tacitus, and with the number and variety of the coins, it is so far confirmed by them, that there seems to be no sufficient reason for adopting the ingenious but unauthorized emendation of Lipsius, who, instead of "*tam nullo quam residuo bello,*" reads "*tanquam nullo residuo bello.*" According to the amended reading, it would be admitted that there was one, and that an important, occasion, viz. during the ceremonies connected with the arrival at Rome of Tiridates king

<sup>d</sup> Suet. in Ner. c. 13. cum notis Burm. et Baumg.

of Parthia, that the temple was closed by Nero ; but this supposition is founded upon a conjectural reading, is insufficient to account for the facts established by the coins, and is irreconcilable with the words of Tacitus : in all these respects the ancient reading, though not free from difficulties, has decidedly the advantage, and therefore ought not to have been discarded, as is the case in some modern editions <sup>e</sup>, from the text of Suetonius.

The reigns of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, were so short, and full of tumult, that I shall confine myself to a few general remarks upon their coinage, and terminate the Lecture with some notice of the controversy that has subsisted respecting the brasses of Otho.

Short and tumultuous, however, as these reigns were—so short, that, when united, they did not amount to seventeen months ; so tumultuous, that, during their continuance, the empire seemed to be totally destitute of civil government—there was no period more prolific of coins, or more boastful, in the inscriptions borne by them, of its liberties and public virtues. “*Securitas et libertas*” appear to have been the favourite inscriptions of a period when every thing was known to be in danger ; “*honos et virtus*,” when such qualities were sel-

<sup>e</sup> See the edition of Baumgarten.

dom cultivated, and often derided ; and even “*salus generis humani*” was then proudly asserted of one of the darkest æras of the human race. But this was the natural consequence of disorder, which always endeavours to supply the want of actual strength by the largeness of its promises, and always finds its hopes frustrated, by the very measures it has taken for their accomplishment. That the coins should be in great abundance, especially those which were minted by the emperors, might be expected, not only from the necessity that existed in such times of warfare for large supplies of money, but also from the convenience they afforded of proclaiming the commencement of a new reign, and conciliating the favour of the empire. The coins of Galba are common in all the metals ; and his titles are written so variously, as to prove the existence of at least twenty-nine different dies, and all of them probably employed at the Roman mint : the gold and silver of Otho and Vitellius are not uncommon : but the difference as to the brasses of the three reigns is most remarkable. In the case of Galba they are so abundant as to be almost worthless ; in the case of Vitellius, who reigned a little longer than Galba, they are extremely rare ; and in the case of Otho no single brass of Roman<sup>f</sup>

<sup>f</sup> The genuine brasses hitherto discovered were evidently minted in Syria, (see Eck. vol. VI. p. 304.) but many spu-

coinage has hitherto been found. There is indeed a brass *restitutus* of the emperor Titus<sup>g</sup>, which professes to be a re-issue of an Otho, and would accordingly seem to prove the issue of a brass coinage during that short and turbulent reign. But the coin is too far open to suspicion to be employed as testimony, where in its own nature it is questionable, and where, even with the most favourable construction, it must stand alone.

And this fact, of the total want of Roman brasses belonging to the reign of Otho, is one of the most remarkable facts of numismatic antiquities. It is usual indeed to look to the discord of the times, and to allege the hostility and the dejection of the senate, as reasons sufficient to account for their unwillingness to issue any coinage, which would acknowledge their submission to Otho. It has also been urged, that the fact may in some degree be explained by the short duration of Otho's reign. But this explanation is inadequate. The gold and silver coins of the same short period are numerous, and even brasses are not uncommon of the still shorter and more distracted reign of Pertinax<sup>h</sup>. And why should their dislike of Otho induce the senate to withhold the coin wanted for

rious brasses were coined by the Italian *falsarii* of the sixteenth century.

<sup>g</sup> Eck. vol. VI. p. 306. Mionnet, vol. I. p. 145.

<sup>h</sup> Mionnet, vol. I. p. 269.

the common circulation of Rome? They regretted the death of Galba; but they were actually under the power and at the mercy of his successor. They dreaded the consequences of a military usurpation; but those consequences were met and averted by the interposition of the usurper<sup>i</sup>. We are expressly told by Tacitus<sup>k</sup>, that when Otho was proclaimed, the senate instantly assembled, and voted him the *Tribunicia potestas*, and the title of Augustus, and all the usual honours of the purple; and we must not suppose that they would withhold the smaller acknowledgments of the coinage, when, in order to do so, they must at the same time be provoking the restless population of Rome to tumult and rebellion. It is possible that the senate may never have issued any brass coin with the insignia of Otho, and may have supplied the wants of Rome by continuing to use the dies of his predecessor; but it is a more reasonable solution, that such coins were actually minted, and may hereafter be brought to light by some fortunate discovery.

<sup>i</sup> Tac. Hist. I. 84.

<sup>k</sup> Hist. I. 47.





## LECTURE IX.

COINS of the empire continued—Vespasian—Rebuilding of the Capitol—Jewish tribute—Titus—The Colosseum—Imperator explained—Domitian—Device of Pallas adopted by him—Flattery of Quinctilian, and hatred of Tacitus—Nerva—Method of travelling—Gregory Nazianzen—System adopted by Augustus—Improved by Nerva—Extended by Hadrian—Trajan—Charitable institutions—Brass plate found near Piacenza—Hadrian—Circenses—The Parilia—Dissertation on the Tribunicia potestas.

.

IMP·CAES·VESPASIAN·AVG·P·M·TR·P·P·  
P·COS·III *Caput laureatum* )-( S·C *Tem-*  
*plum perelegans sex columnarum, statuīs*  
*superne atque utrinque exornatum, in cuius*  
*medio signum Jovis sedentis, cui ad dextram*  
*adstat Pallas, ad sinistram Juno. ÆN.*

THE third consulship of Vespasian corresponds with the year 71 after Christ, a year distinguished in the annals of Rome for the establishment of peace abroad and the restoration of tranquillity at home. In this year was celebrated the triumph decreed to the emperor and his son Titus for the conquest of Judæa, the temple of Janus was solemnly closed, and the city was rising with increased lustre from the ruin and destruction of a state of anarchy. The temple represented on the coin, and connected with the honours offered by the senate to Vespasian, is clearly the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, which was at this time building, in the place of the more ancient temple destroyed by fire during the recent tumults.

But the subject is involved in some difficulty, owing to a difference that subsists between the historians of the time; and though the question itself is of minor importance, and the evidence of the coin is not decisive, yet as the accuracy of

Tacitus is at stake, and several great events were passing at the period, it may be well to state the point at issue, and as far as possible to elucidate it.

Tacitus<sup>a</sup> informs us that the foundations of this temple were laid with the greatest solemnity on the 11th of the calends of July in the year 70; but states that Vespasian himself was absent, and had appointed Vestinus to represent him. Suetonius<sup>b</sup> on the contrary, who is supported by the Abridgment of Dio<sup>c</sup>, states that Vespasian was present in person, mentioning even the part that he took in preparing the ground for laying the foundation. The coin might appear at first sight to confirm the statement of Suetonius and Dio, as it might seem to connect the rebuilding of the temple with the presence of Vespasian; it being presumed, that the senate would not have selected that temple as an ornament for his coin, if he had not taken a personal interest in restoring it.

But what were the facts of the case? It had been determined by the senate<sup>d</sup> in the preceding year to rebuild the Capitol, but delay having arisen owing to the want of money, the matter appears to have been referred to Vespasian then absent. Doubtless he encouraged the undertaking; and this may be inferred not only from the popularity of such a measure, and the commission ac-

<sup>a</sup> Hist. IV. 53.

<sup>b</sup> Suet. Vesp. c. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Dio, LXVI. 10.

<sup>d</sup> Tac. Hist. IV. 4. and IV. 9.

tually given by him to carry it into effect, but also from an order issued by him soon after the return of Titus, and recorded by Josephus<sup>e</sup>, requiring that the didrachm, which the Jews had been accustomed to pay for the service of their temple, should for the future be paid by them for the use of the Capitol. It appears moreover from the course of events, that Vespasian returned to Rome within a few months after the foundations of the temple were laid, and that the brass, which we are treating of, was minted in the following year; at the time probably, when Vespasian was issuing his order for the addition of the Jewish tribute to the treasures of the Capitol.

Upon the whole, then, the coin cannot be alleged as evidence in favour of Suetonius, because it was not minted for more than twelve months after the foundations were laid; on the contrary, it tends to establish, what Tacitus has stated, that Vespasian was not present at the ceremony; inasmuch as it was not minted at the time when the ceremony took place, and was actually minted at a subsequent period, at which we learn, for the first time and from another writer, that the temple was enriched by the edict of the emperor.

The three deities represented on the coin are the same to whom, according to Tacitus<sup>f</sup>, the building was consecrated.

<sup>e</sup> De Bell. Jud. VII. 6. 6.

<sup>f</sup> Hist. IV. 53.

IMP·TITVS·CAES·VESPASIAN·AVG·P·M

*Caput laureatum* )-( TR·P·IX·IMP·XV·

COS·VIII·P·P *Elephas loricatus*. Aur. Arg.

The ninth Tribunicia Potestas of the emperor Titus began in the middle of the year 80, the year preceding his death. It was the year immediately following the completion of the enormous amphitheatre, now known by the name of the Colosseum; and when accordingly we may expect to meet with constant traces of the spectacles exhibited to the populace of Rome. And an occasion of this kind is clearly denoted on the coin by the *elephas loricatus*<sup>g</sup>, an animal which it had been the practice from the time of the republic to introduce into the contests of the arena: and four elephants are expressly mentioned in the Abridgment of Dio<sup>h</sup>, as among the 9000 animals slaughtered in the wild and horrible destruction which took place on the opening of the Colosseum. The number is stated more sparingly by Suetonius<sup>i</sup>: “Amphitheatro dedicato, thermisque juxta  
“ celeriter exstructis, munus edidit apparatissi-  
“ mum largissimumque. Dedit et navale prælium  
“ in veteri naumachia; ibidem et gladiatores: at-  
“ que uno die quinque millia omne genus fera-  
“ rum.”

This coin, like many others, affords us an in-

<sup>g</sup> See Plin. H. N. lib. VIII. c. 4.      <sup>h</sup> Xiphil. LXVI. 25.

<sup>i</sup> Suet. Tit. Vit. c. 7.

stance of the two meanings of the word *imperator*, presented at the same time; the one referring to the highest office in the state, the other denoting the number of times on which Titus had been saluted by his troops as conqueror. The first time<sup>k</sup> was after the memorable capture of Jerusalem; the fifteenth, as is stated in the transactions of this year by the abbreviator of Dio<sup>l</sup>, was in acknowledgment of the victories obtained by Agricola in Britain—victories which might speedily have led to the total subjugation of the island, but were in reality followed by the disgrace and retirement of the commander who achieved them.

IMP·CAES·DOMITIAN·AVG·GERMANI-  
CVS *Caput laureatum* )-( P·M·TR·POT·  
III·IMP·V·COS·X·P·P *Pallas stans*. Aur.  
Arg.

The emperor Titus having died in the September of the year 81, the third Tribunicia Potestas of Domitian must have ended in the same month of the year 84. In this year too, or at the close of the preceding one, he assumed the title of Germanicus, on account of his successes over the Catti; retaining it, as we find from his other coins, for the rest of his reign. But the most remarkable circumstance connected with the coin is the intro-

<sup>k</sup> Suet. c. 5. Joseph. B. J. VI. 6. 1.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. LXVI. c. 20. Tac. Agric. XL. 3.

duction of a new device in the figure of Pallas ; a device too which occupies the place generally assigned to the more agreeable office of recording the personal merits of the emperor. By the aid of history this device is easily explained, and reflects in its turn some little confirmation on the history that explains it. We learn from Suetonius<sup>m</sup> that Domitian was peculiarly devoted to the worship of Pallas ; but had we learnt nothing further, it would scarcely have been considered a sufficient reason for the constant appearance of the head of Pallas on the medals of his reign. The doubt however is completely removed by a passage of Philostratus<sup>n</sup>, which might itself have otherwise fallen under some suspicion, in stating that Domitian publicly declared himself to be the son of Pallas, and required accordingly that divine honours should be paid to him.

It was with reference to this devotedness of the emperor, that Quintilian<sup>o</sup> thus addresses him, in a passage full of the basest adulation : “ Quis cerneret bella melius quam qui sic gerit? Quem præsidentes studiis Deæ propius audirent? Cui magis suas artes aperiret familiare numen Minervæ? Dicent hæc plenius futura sæcula.” The future generations to whom Quintilian was

<sup>m</sup> Domit. c. 15.

<sup>n</sup> Vit. Apollon. l. VII. c. 24. Plin. Paneg. XXXIII. 4.

<sup>o</sup> Inst. Or. lib. X. c. 1.



willing to refer for a confirmation of his flattery, have, on the contrary, adopted the stern and just execration of Tacitus<sup>p</sup>: “Dedimus profecto grande  
 “patientiæ documentum; et sicut vetus ætas vidit,  
 “quid ultimum in libertate esset, ita nos, quid in  
 “servitute, adempto per inquisitiones et loquendi  
 “audiendique commercio. Memoriam quoque ip-  
 “sam cum voce perdidissemus, si tam in nostra  
 “potestate esset oblivisci quam tacere.”

IMP·NERVA·CAES·AVG·P·M·TR·P·COS·  
 III·P·P *Caput laureatum* )—( VEHICVLA-  
 TIONE·ITALIAE·REMISSA· S·C *Duæ*  
*mulæ pascentes; pone vehiculum. Æn.*

The *Vehiculatio*, or “Munus vehicularium,” was the office of providing conveyances along the great roads of the empire, for persons travelling on public business. At a later period, Gregory Nazianzen, afterwards raised to the see of Constantino-ple, describes the village of Cappadocia, where he first discharged his pastoral duties, and complains, in language which may remind us of more recent grievances<sup>q</sup>, of the tumults occasioned in the place

<sup>p</sup> Agric. Vit. c. 2.

<sup>q</sup> A living prelate, who is not surpassed by Gregory in the three points in which he was preeminent, his scholarship, his manliness, and his piety, has made similar complaints of the tumults created in the scene of his earlier labours by the presence of a posting-house. See Bishop Blomfield’s Letter on the Lord’s Day, p. 19.

by its being the station of a Roman post-house, and the strange mixture of travellers and vagrants that formed a considerable portion of his flock :

*κόνις τὰ πάντα, καὶ ψόφοι σὺν ἄρμασι,  
θρῆνοι, στεναγμοὶ, πράκτορες, στρέβλαι, πέδαι·  
λαὸς δ' ὅσοι ξένοι τε καὶ πλανώμενοι.  
αὕτη Σασίμων τῶν ἐμῶν ἐκκλησία<sup>r</sup>.*

Now although this account was written nearly two centuries after the time of Nerva, yet, as it refers to a remote province of the empire, it may be taken as descriptive of the activity which prevailed at a much earlier period on the great roads of Italy.

Before the time of Augustus no plan had been adopted systematically for the service of the Roman roads. At an early period, indeed, envoys, travelling on urgent business, were authorized to demand beasts of burden from the towns upon their route; but all other public officers, whose business did not require despatch, were provided before their departure with the outfit requisite for their journey, and had recourse to the hospitality of friends or acquaintance, which they repaid by similar attentions on their return to Rome. This distinction, however, was easily evaded; and, as early as the year 173 B.C.<sup>s</sup>, we find a consul issuing orders to the magistrates of Præneste, to

<sup>r</sup> De vita sua, §. 32.

<sup>s</sup> Liv. XLII. 1.

prepare suitable apartments for his reception, and horses to convey him on his journey. And in this manner, imposing great hardship upon the provinces, and giving occasion to constant complaints, the service of the roads was conducted till the time of Augustus.

This skilful monarch<sup>t</sup>, anxious to have early and accurate intelligence from the provinces, stationed messengers at moderate intervals upon the public roads, and provided carriages for their use; but his plan does not appear to have extended beyond the arrangements necessary for couriers and confidential agents of the government. It laid the foundation indeed for the general system of posts established afterwards, but it appears still to have been accompanied with those powers of impressment, in all other cases, which had previously supplied the only means of public communication. It is evident from our coin that Nerva introduced an important change in the ancient practice, by relieving the towns of Italy from the oppressive service. And this testimony is the more valuable, because not only have the biographers of Nerva made no mention of the fact, but also subsequent writers have spoken in general terms of the changes made by Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, as though the ancient practice had continued in

<sup>t</sup> Suet. Aug. c. 49.

all its rigour until their time. The Augustan historian<sup>u</sup> says of the former monarch, "Statim  
" cursum fiscale instituit, ne magistratus hoc  
" onere gravarentur." The probability is, that  
Nerva had already established posts upon the public roads of Italy, and made the service chargeable upon his own exchequer; and that Hadrian, perceiving the advantage of the improvement, extended it to all the provinces of the empire.

IMP·CAES·NERVAE·TRAIANO·AVG·  
GER·DAC·P·M·TR·P·COS·V·P·P *Caput  
laureatum* )-( ALIM·ITAL·S·C *Imperator  
sedens dextram extendit versus mulierem ad-  
stantem cum binis infantibus, quorum unum  
in ulnis gestat, adstante altero. Æn.*

The medal bearing this inscription, and clearly referring to the foundling-hospitals and other charitable institutions of Trajan, is a token of the gratitude of the senate, and might fitly be their answer to the panegyric of the younger Pliny<sup>x</sup> delivered before them in honour of the same emperor. The encomiast does not fail to dwell on the munificence of his sovereign. "Paullo minus, " patres conscripti, quinque millia ingenuorum fuerunt, quæ liberalitas principis nostri conquirit, invenit, adscivit; hi subsidium bellorum,

<sup>u</sup> Hadrian. Vit. c. 7. Antonin. c. 12.      <sup>x</sup> Paneg. c. 28.

“ornamentum pacis, publicis sumptibus aluntur;  
 “patriamque non ut patriam tantum verum ut  
 “altricem amare condisunt. Ex his castra, ex  
 “his tribus replebuntur, ex his quandoque nas-  
 “centur, quibus alimentis opus non sit.”

The medal cannot be assigned to any precise date, as the expression COS·V, the only part of the inscription which might seem to intimate the exact year, is applicable to any part of the reign of Trajan, from the year 104 to the year 111 inclusive. But it is not necessary to attempt a more precise account of it; for it may readily be supposed, that the liberality of the emperor, which had in the first instance been employed in supporting five thousand children in the capital, would gradually be obtained for other places of large and needy population, and eventually be extended to the smaller towns of Italy. So rapid and extensive would be the progress of a measure, which released parents from the support of their children<sup>y</sup>, and created by its own operation new and endless claims upon its bounty.

But this case is strikingly illustrated by an in-

<sup>y</sup> And so Pliny clearly foresaw: (Paneg. c. 23.) “Quanto  
 “majorem infantium turbam iterum atque iterum videbis  
 “incidi (augetur enim quotidie et crescit, non quia cariores  
 “parentibus liberi, sed quia principi cives) dabis congiaria si  
 “voles, præstabis alimenta si voles, illi tamen propter te  
 “nascuntur.”

scription, as remarkable as any one that has ever fallen under the notice of antiquaries. In the year 1747 a brass plate,  $10\frac{1}{2}$  Italian feet wide, and  $5\frac{1}{2}$  in height, and covered with an inscription in several columns, was dug up in the neighbourhood of Piacenza, and at a short distance from the Via Æmilia. The inscription has been explained by Muratori<sup>z</sup>, Maffei<sup>a</sup>, and others; but the only notice which can here be given of it is, that it belongs to the same date with the medal; that it records the bounty conferred by Trajan upon the obscure town of Veleia, a town almost unknown in ancient history; that it specifies the monthly allowance granted to 281 children belonging to this town; and describes, with the greatest exactness, the proprietors in the neighbourhood, with the reports made by them of the value of their property, and the sums which they received on mortgage; binding themselves in return to pay the moderate interest of five per cent. for the support of the institution.

The last specimen which I shall notice is a gold coin of Hadrian, bearing inscriptions and devices, which are also to be found on a large brass of the senate, minted at the same period. It is natural to suppose that they refer to some

<sup>z</sup> Sposizione fatta da L. A. Muratori, in the *Symb. Litt.* of Gori. Flor. 1748. vol. V.

<sup>a</sup> *Museum Veronense*. Veron. 1749. p. 399.

gracious act, calculated equally to call forth the ostentation of the emperor and the gratitude of the senate.

IMP·CAES·HADRIANVS·AVG·COS·III  
*Caput laureatum* )-( ANN·DCCCLXXIIII·  
 NAT·VRB·P·CIR·CON *Mulier humi se-*  
*dens d. rotam s. tres obeliscos seu conos com-*  
*plexa.* Aur. Æn.

The device on the reverse of this coin would sufficiently shew, without the aid of the inscription, the kind of occasion on which it was struck. It evidently denotes some addition made by the emperor to the exhibitions of the circus; the wheel referring to the chariot-race, and the three cones to the obelisks placed at each extremity of the barrier, by which the circus was divided. But the exact occasion is not so easily ascertained. Hadrian obtained the title of COS·III in the year after the death of his predecessor; and, as he did not accept the office at any subsequent period, continued to use the same title during the whole of his reign. The date also of DCCCLXXIIII. which clearly commences from the foundation of the city, might be supposed likely to furnish us with the exact year. But this is almost the only instance of the Roman æra appearing upon a coin; and though it is on that account the more curious, it is for the same reason the less valuable

for historical purposes, as there are no means of discovering, which of the methods of computing the foundation of Rome has been followed by it<sup>b</sup>.

The inscription itself is an instance of the perplexity, that has been inflicted upon modern antiquaries by the abbreviations of ancient writing; different interpretations having been given to it according to the different meanings assigned to the letter P. It is clear that it must be the representative of some word of general occurrence in Roman inscriptions, the meaning of which could easily have been supplied by the common reader. And such, thought Vaillant, would be the word *populus*; and he accordingly completed the inscription in the following manner: "Anno 874 natali urbis populo Circenses concessi." But this conjecture is opposed by the well-known fact, that the games of the Circus had long been familiar to the Romans, and could not, without extreme absurdity, be said to have been established by Hadrian. Another attempt was made to explain the enigma by supposing the letter to denote *plebei*, and to mean that games were exhibited for the amusement of the lower classes of the people. But this again is inconsistent with the fact that the Circus had always been open for all orders alike, and that such mixed and more splen-

<sup>b</sup> Petavius, Doct. Temp. vol. II. p. 67. fol.



did exhibitions would naturally have the greatest attractions for the populace. A more plausible interpretation is by the word *primum*, the inscription being made to signify, that on the 874th anniversary of the foundation of Rome, the day on which the festival of Parilia was held, games of the circus were added, for the first time, by the emperor Hadrian, to give greater splendour to the festival. To me, however, it appears the best method to retain the word *populo*, as suggested by Vaillant; a word which is constantly denoted on coins by the single letter P; and to make the inscription refer, in the same restricted manner, to the circenses granted to the people, for the first time, on that occasion of holding the Parilia. And certainly we may infer, from the description of the festival given by Ovid<sup>c</sup> and Propertius, that in their times it was celebrated with great simplicity, and in a manner calculated to remind the Romans of its origin, but little likely to satisfy the taste of a luxurious people. And that Hadrian did actually make some addition to this festival, and changed its name to *Feriæ Romanæ*, honouring it at the same time by a temple, consecrated to the genius of Rome, is evident from a passage of Athenæus<sup>d</sup>, from which we learn that the con-

<sup>c</sup> Fast. IV. 721. El. IV. 4. See also Plut. Rom. c. 12.

<sup>d</sup> Athen. lib. VIII. c. 63.

versation of his deipnosophists was interrupted by the loud sounds of mirth and music, occasioned by the festival, as it was then celebrated by the whole population of Rome, in the reign of the best and most classical of monarchs.

I have now to conclude with a brief disquisition on the tribunicia potestas, the materials for which are derived, as has been the case in many other instances, from the elaborate work of Eckhel.

I have already stated that this title was adopted by Augustus as the least likely to create a feeling of jealousy or suspicion against his government. This is the reason assigned by Tacitus<sup>e</sup>, “*Id summi fastigii vocabulum Augustus reperit, ne regis aut dictatoris nomen adsumeret, ac tamen adpellatione aliqua cetera imperia præmineret.*” And, in order to deviate as little as possible from the practice of the republic, and to preserve the ancient rights of the tribuneship unimpaired, the emperor was not appointed to the office of tribune, but merely invested with its privileges. Being a patrician, he was ineligible to the office; and this distinction was so anxiously maintained, that tribunes of the people were appointed during the time of the empire, as they had previously been;

<sup>e</sup> Ann. lib. III. c. 56.

and though their authority fell gradually into decay, the regular appointment of them is supposed to have continued to so late a period as the reign of Constantine.

But the popular title thus assumed by the emperor conveyed, in reality, much greater powers than belonged to the actual office of the tribune. In the latter case the office was conferred for a single year, was incapable of being held together with any other appointment, and was confined, as to the exercise of it, within the precincts of the city. The *tribunicia potestas*, on the contrary, was conferred on the emperor for a term of years, or more commonly for life, created no disqualification for the holding of other offices, and was of equal authority in all parts of the empire. The tribunes, moreover, were appointed annually in the month of December, when the state officers in general were appointed; but the *potestas* was conferred at any period, whenever an emperor was admitted, either solely or conjointly, to the exercise of the imperial functions.

And this leads to an inquiry of much importance with reference to the chronology of this period, viz. from what time the commencement of the second year of holding the *tribunicia potestas* was calculated; whether from the return of the day on which the title was conferred, or, according to the practice of other offices, from the end

of the month of December. It is evident that great confusion might arise in the adjustment of dates, if this point were not previously considered and ascertained. Nero, for instance, was proclaimed emperor, and invested with tribunician powers in the month of October, in the year 54: it is evident, therefore, that with a view to accuracy, not only in this, but in every other year of his reign, it must be known whether the first year of the potestas contained only the two months still remaining in the year 54, or included also the ten other months extending to the October of the following year. If this point be not ascertained, all the events which occurred in any year of Nero's reign, between January and October, may be assigned by different persons, calculating alike on the tribunicia potestas, to different years. The testimony to be obtained from coins depends peculiarly upon this description of date, and makes it the more important that the question should be accurately solved.

It has been the opinion, then, of some of the most eminent writers on Roman chronology, whose authority might be deemed sufficient in itself to terminate the dispute, that the tribunician powers were dated every year from the return of the day on which they were originally conferred. It is natural that the day of a sovereign's accession should be made an epoch for all the transactions

of his reign. It might even be expected, that, where there is no fixed system of chronology, the former methods of computing time would be made to accommodate themselves to the new æra; and that all subordinate offices would date their commencement from the accession of the reigning sovereign. And this opinion seems to be confirmed by a passage of Dio<sup>f</sup>, in which the years of each reign are said to be computed from the time of obtaining the tribunician powers; but a stronger proof is afforded by many inscriptions on coins, which shew plainly that the tribunician years were not calculated from the customary day of electing state officers, but from some distinct epoch of their own. We find, for instance, in the case of Caligula, two coins bearing alike the inscription COS III, but differing as to the tribunician date; the one of them<sup>g</sup> being inscribed TR·POT·III; the other, TR·P·IIII. Now Caligula succeeded to the throne in the calends of April of the year 37; so that, according to the present supposition, the third year of the trib. pot. would terminate, and the fourth would begin, in the same calends of the year 40, the current year of his third consulship. And this is exactly the supposition which the coins would appear to verify.

From these and similar considerations, it might

<sup>f</sup> Lib. LIII. c. 17.

<sup>g</sup> Eckh. vol. VI. p. 225.

be admitted that the tribunicia potestas was computed in perfect calendar years from the accession of each emperor respectively. And this appears, on examination, to have been the case in all the earlier reigns of the empire, and whilst the title was considered as the real conveyance of authority. But we must not hastily infer that the practice continued to be the same at all periods. It would not be surprising if, at a subsequent time, when the emperor had thrown off all respect for the senate, and the names of office assumed by him were equally unmeaning, the tribunicia potestas should be found to date, like the rest of his titles, from the commencement of the civil year. And, on examination, we have reason to believe that this had already begun to be the case in the reign of Elagabalus. This emperor did not reign four complete years; and as we meet with the expression TR·P·V upon several of his coins, we are thereby compelled to suppose that the portion of the year, which still remained after his accession, was calculated as a perfect year of office. He became emperor in the middle of the year 218; the second year of his trib. pot. began with the commencement of 219; and by this method of calculation, his fifth year of the same title began with the commencement of 222, and terminated with his death in the March following.

Other cases of the same kind might easily be

adduced; and the facts being admitted, it will follow, that at some time previously to the reign of Elagabalus a change had taken place in the ancient practice, and the trib. pot. had been made to date, in every instance, from the end of the month of December. Eckhel has traced the change, after a close examination of successive coins, to the reign of Antoninus Pius; and thinks that he is able to assign it, by still more exact testimony, to the precise year in which it was introduced. He produces a coin of Aurelius, minted when he was Cæsar, and therefore in the reign of Antoninus Pius; which bears on the reverse, in close juxtaposition, the two conflicting dates, TR·POT·VII·TR·POT·VIII. In what method can this contradiction be explained, unless you suppose that the coin was minted at the very period when the change was made, and in one of those dubious months at the commencement of the civil year, which, according to the ancient practice, belonged to the seventh year of the tribunician title, but, according to the new style, was reckoned in the eighth?

However this may be, it is not unreasonable to conclude that it was the original practice of the Romans to calculate the tribunicia potestas by perfect years, from the first assumption of the title by each emperor respectively; and that an

alteration was made in the time of Antoninus Pius, by which this title of authority, like all the rest, was made to date from the commencement of the civil year.



GRECIAN COINS,  
REFERRED TO IN LECTURE V.

---

[ÆGINA.]

ΦΙΔΟ *Diota* )-( *Clypeus Bæoticus*. Arg.

ATHENS.

*Caput Palladis* )-( ΑΘΕ *Noctua stans; pone, olive ramus et luna crescens; ante, quiddam ignotum*. Aur.

*Caput Palladis* )-( ΑΘΕ ΒΑΣΙΛΕ ΜΙΘΡΑΔΑΤΗΣ  
*Noctua diotæ insistens; in area astra solis et lunæ*. Arg.

*Caput Palladis* )-( ΑΘΗΝ *Rupes super qua templum; juxta statua Palladis et porta ad quam gradus per rupem ducunt*. Æn.

*Caput Palladis* )-( ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ *Vir nudus toto nisu prægrandem lapidem erigit*. Æn.

LACEDÆMON.

*Caput Palladis* )-( ΛΑ *Hercules nudus petrae leonis exuviis coopertæ insidens. d. clavam*. Arg.

*Caput Herculis imberbe leonis exuviis tectum*  
 )-( ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΡΕΟΣ *Jupiter sedens d. aquilam s. hastam.* Arg.

## BŒOTIA.

*Clypeus Bæoticus* )-( ΕΡΧ intra coronam spiccam. Arg.

ΘΕ *Caput imberbe Herculis* )-( *Clypeus Bæoticus cui inserta clava.* Arg.

## ELIS.

*Caput Jovis laureatum* )-( ΦΑΛΕΙΩΝ intra lauream. Æn.



ROMAN COINS OF THE REPUBLIC,  
 REFERRED TO IN LECTURE VII.

P·ACCOLEIVS·LARISCOLVS *Caput muliebre*  
 )-( *Tres virgines adversæ stantes in arbores mutantur.* Arg.

*Caput muliebre* )-( M·LEPIDVS·AN·XV·PR·H·  
 O·C·S *Eques lento gressu s. tropæum gestat.*  
 Arg.

ALEXANDREA *Caput muliebre turritum* )-(  
 M·LEPIDVS·PONT·MAX·TVTOR·REG.  
 S·C *Lepidus togatus stans regi togato adstanti  
 et d. hastam tenenti diadema imponit.* Arg.

MARCELLINVS *Caput virile imberbe nudum ;  
 pone triquetra* )-( MARCELLVS·COS·QUINQ  
*Templum quatuor columnarum, ad quod vir ve-  
 latus et togatus accedit tropæum gestans.* Arg.

*Caput nudum barbatum ; pone OSCA* )-( P·  
 LENT·P·F·SPINT *Vir barbatus velatus semi-  
 nudus sedens in sella curuli d. cornu copiae s.  
 hastam, et d. pede globo insistens coronatur  
 ab advolante Victoria.* Arg.

*Protome Mercurii ; pone litera Alphabeti* )-( C·  
 MAMIL·LIMETAN *Vir curto habitu, tectus  
 pileo rotundo, s. scipionem habens graditur ; ei  
 adblanditur canis.* Arg.

I·S·M·R *Caput Junonis Sispitæ* )-( L·THORIVS·  
 BALBVS *Bos irruens ; superne varians Al-  
 phabeti litera.* Arg.

*Protome Victoriæ alata* )-( LVGV DVNI·A·XL  
*Leo gradiens.* Arg.

IIIVIR·R·P·C *Protome Victoriæ alata* )-( AN-  
 TONI·IMP·A·XLI *Leo gradiens.* Arg.

M·ANTONIVS·IMP·COS·DESIG·ITER·ET·  
TERT *Caput Antonii hedera redimitum; in-*  
*fra lituus; omnia intra coronam hederaceam*  
)-( IIIVIR·R·P·C *Cista Bacchi inter duos ser-*  
*pentes, cui imminet caput muliebre nudum.*  
Arg.

---

## ROMAN COINS OF THE EMPIRE,

REFERRED TO IN LECTURES VIII. AND IX.

CAESAR·COS·VII·CIVIBVS·SERVATEIS *Ca-*  
*put nudum*)-( AVGVSTVS·S·C *Aquila expan-*  
*sis alis coronæ quernæ insistens; pone duo lauri*  
*rami.* Aur.

AVGVSTVS·TR·POT·VIII *Caput nudum*)-(  
*Cippus, cui inscriptum S·P·Q·R·IMP·CAE·*  
*QVOD·V·M·S·EX·EA·P·Q·IS·AD·A·DE; in*  
*orbem L·VINICIVS·L·F·IIIVIR.* Arg.

TI·CAESAR·DIVI·AVG·F·AVGVST·P·M·TR·  
POT·XXIII *in medio S·C*)-( CIVITATIBVS·  
ASIAE·RESTITVTIS *Imperator togatus ca-*  
*pite laureato sedens pedibus scabello fultis d:*  
*pateram s. hastam.* Æn.

ΘΕΟΝ·ΤΕΡΜ---- ΜΤΤΙ *Caput Germanici nudum*  
 )-( ΘΕΑΝ·ΑΙΟΛΙΝ·ΑΓΡΙΠΠΙΝΑΝ·ΜΤΤΙ *Caput*  
*Agrippinæ. Æn.*

С·CAESAR·DIVI·AVG·PRON·AVG·S·C *Pileus*  
*libertatis* )-( COS·DES·III·PON·M·TR·P·III·  
 P·P; *in medio RCC. Æn.*

TI·CLAVD·CAESAR·AVG·P·M·TR·P·VI·IMP·  
 XI *Caput laureatum* )-( DE·BRITANN *in-*  
*scriptum arcui triumphali, supra quem statua*  
*equestris inter duo tropæa. Aur. Arg.*

IMP·NERO·CLAVD·CAESAR·AVG·GER·P·  
 M·TR·P·P·P *Caput laureatum* )-( PACE·P·R·  
 TERRA·MARIQ·PARTA·IANVM·CLVSIT  
*Templum Jani clausis foribus. Aur. Æn.*

IMP·CAES·VESPASIAN·AVG·P·M·TR·P·P·P·  
 COS·III *Caput laureatum* )-( S·C *Templum*  
*perelegans sex columnarum, statuâ superne*  
*atque utrinque exornatum, in cujus medio sig-*  
*num Jovis sedentis, cui ad dextram adstat Pal-*  
*las, ad sinistram Juno. Æn.*

IMP·TITVS·CAES·VESPASIAN·AVG·P·M  
*Caput laureatum* )-( TR·P·IX·IMP·XV·  
 COS·VIII·P·P *Elephas loricatus. Aur.*  
*Arg.*

IMP·CAES·DOMITIAN·AVG·GERMANICVS  
*Caput laureatum* )-( P·M·TR·POT·III·IMP·V·  
 COS·X·P·P *Pallas stans.* Aur. Arg.


IMP·NERVA·CAES·AVG·P·M·TR·P·COS·III·  
 P·P *Caput laureatum* )-( VEHICVLATIONE·  
 ITALIAE·REMISSA·S·C *Duæ mulæ pas-*  
*centes ; pone vehiculum.* Æn.

IMP·CAES·NERVAE·TRAIANO·AVG·GER·  
 DAC·P·M·TR·P·COS·V·P·P *Caput laureatum*  
 )-( ALIM·ITAL·S·C *Imperator sedens dex-*  
*tram extendit versus mulierem adstantem cum*  
*binis infantibus, quorum unum in ulnis gestat,*  
*adstante altero.* Æn.

IMP·CAES·HADRIANVS·AVG·COS·III *Caput*  
*laureatum* )-( ANN·DCCCLXXIII·NAT·  
 VRB·P·CIR·CON *Mulier humi sedens d. rotam*  
*s. tres obeliscos seu conos complexa.* Aur. Æn.

AVRELIVS·CAESAR·AVG·PII·F *Caput nudum*  
 )-( TR·POT·VII·TR·POT·VIII·S·C *Mulier*  
*galeata sedens d. hastam ; humi clypeus.*







M H 23.11.45

17851.

HN

C 26931cx

Author Cardwell, Edward.

Title Lectures on the coinage of the Greeks and Romans

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
LIBRARY

Do not  
remove  
the card  
from this  
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket  
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."  
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

